

CHAPTER II.

ACCOUNTS OF OLD KASHMIR.

SECTION I.—CLASSICAL NOTICES.

5. Our sources for the early geography of Kashmīr may be conveniently divided into foreign notices and indigenous records. As the information supplied by the former is on the whole earlier in date though by no means more precise or important, we shall commence our review with them. Having learned what little the outer world knew or recorded of the secluded alpine land, we shall appreciate all the more the imposing array of Kashmīrian authorities which offer themselves as our guides in and about the Valley. With the foreign accounts but in a kind of intermediate position we may class those Indian texts the authors of which may have possessed some more detailed information of Kashmīr, but have not thought it necessary to vouchsafe it to us.

It is significant for the isolated position which its mountain barriers assured to Kashmīr, that we do not find any mention of the country in those accounts to which we are accustomed to look for the first truly historical notices of the North-West of India. I mean the relations of Alexander's invasion. The march from Taxila to the Hydaspes (Jehlām) took the Macedonian forces along a line of route which lay comparatively near to the confines of Kashmīr. Yet there is no notice in the accounts of Alexander's expedition which can be shown to imply even a hearsay knowledge of the Kashmīr Valley. On the other hand the names of the neighbouring territories on the West and South have long ago been recognized in the names of their rulers *Arsakes* and

Abisares. These names clearly represent ethnic appellations derived from *Urasā* (Ptolemy's *Oṽapσα*) and *Abhisāra*.¹

The only certain reference to Kaśmīr which classical literature has preserved for us, is found in PTOLEMY'S *Geography*. There can be no doubt that D'Anville was right in recognizing its name in that of the region of *Κασπερία* situated 'below the sources of the Bidaspes (*Vitastā*) and of the Sandabal (*Candrabhāgā*) and of the Adris (*Irāvātī*)'.² Ptolemy mentions this territory correctly enough between that of the *Daradrai* or Dards on the Indus and *Kylindrine* or the land of the Kulindas on the Hyphasis (*Biās*) and eastwards. In his subsequent detailed description of Indian territories, however, he makes the region 'held by' the Kaspeiræans' extend eastwards from the land of the Pandoouoi on the Bidaspes as far as Mount Ouindion or the Vindhya.³

It is clear that the limits here indicated which would embrace a great portion of the present Panjāb with parts of the North-West Provinces and Central India, can have nothing to do with Kaśmīr. It has been suggested that Ptolemy's statement refers to a period when the power of the dynasty ruling over Kaśmīr actually extended over the wide territories above indicated.⁴ The assumption, put into a form more in keeping with historical probability, would be that Kaśmīr was then subject to a great foreign dominion the rulers of which, for one reason or the other, were in Ptolemy's source designated from this part of their realm.

However this may be, it is curious to note that we meet with the name *Κάσπερα* also in the long list of cities located within the region belonging to the Kaspeiræans. The geographical position assigned to it by Ptolemy's table (or map) would bring Kaspeira close to the junction of the Hydaspes and Zaradros (*Satlej*), *i.e.*, the neighbourhood of Multān.⁵ Yet it seems difficult to believe that the information originally underlying this entry referred to any other locality but Kaśmīr.⁶

¹ See LASSEN, *Ind. Alt.*, ii. p. 174; WILSON, *Essay*, p. 116; also my notes on *Rājatar.* i. 180; v. 217.

² See Ptolemy VII. i. 42 and pp. 21, 40 sq. in *Antiquité Géographique de l'Inde*, par M. D'Anville, *Premier Géographe du Roi*, etc., Paris, 1775.—The accuracy and sound judgment displayed in this work fully justify the great fame it has enjoyed.

³ Ptolemy, VII. i. 47.

⁴ Compare, *e.g.*, LASSEN, *Ind. Alt.* ii. p. 898; V. DE ST. MARTIN, *Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscriptions*, Sav. étrang., 1^{re} Série, t. v., p. 380.

⁵ See the old map reproduced in DR. MCCRINDLE'S *Ancient India as described by Ptolemy*, Bombay, 1885.

⁶ This had been rightly seen already by D'ANVILLE. He points out, p. 40, that the error in latitude implied by Ptolemy's position of Kaspeira (if Srmagar

It would be useless to attempt to seek now for an explanation of the erroneous location. The researches of the most competent scholars have amply proved how little reliance can be placed on the apparent exactness of Ptolemy's latitudes and longitudes in the Asiatic portion of his work.¹ None of the other city names in the same list can be connected with Kaśmīr. Nor is the identification of any one of them certain, except that of Μόδουρα ἡ τῶν Θεῶν, the sacred Mathurā. This alone suffices to show how far away from Kaśmīr we are liable to be taken.

The value of Ptolemy's notice of *Kaspeiria* lies mainly in the fact that it presents us with an accurate enough transcription of that form of the country's name which on independent phonetic evidence we must assume as an intermediate stage between the Sanskrit *Kaśmīra* and the modern Kaśmīrī form *Kaśīr*. The explanations given below (§ 36) will show that a well-established phonetic law presupposes a form **Kaśvīra* for the earlier Prakrit stage of Kaśmīrī. Of this form we have in *Kaspeira* (pronounced *Kaspīra*) as close a rendering as Greek writing permitted.²

The Sanskrit form of the name, *Kaśmīra*, has, as far as we can go back, been always the one in official use. By it the country has been, and is still to this day, generally known abroad (Hindī *Kaśmīr*, Persian *Kashmīr*.) The preservation of the popular Prakrit **Kaśvīra* by Ptolemy deserves hence attention with regard to the original source from which this particular item of information was obtained.

6. It is very probable that we have also to connect with Kaśmīr a curious notice which Stephen of Byzance has preserved from the *Bassarika*, a lost poem of Dionysios of Samos. The passage, first apparently noticed by D'Anville, mentions the KASPEIROI as a tribe famous among all Indians for their fast feet.³ We do not know the (is really meant) is not greater than that which can plainly be proved in the case of his entry for *Barbarei*, the port at the mouth of the Indus.

¹ I cannot refrain from quoting here in full the very just remarks of SIR HENRY YULE, *Cathay and the Way Thither*, p. cli, which ought ever to be remembered by those who have to deal with Ptolemy on Indian soil. "We see here how Ptolemy's Asiatic Geography was compiled. It is evident that he first drew his maps embodying all information that he had procured, however vague and rough it might be. From these maps he then deduced his tables of latitudes and longitudes and his systematic topography. The result is that everything assumes an appearance of exact definition; and indications on the map which meant no more than (somewhere hereabouts is said to be such a country), became translated into a precision fit for an Act of Parliament."

² Thus the tribal name *Aspasioi* of Arrian (iv. 23) reproduces the Sanskrit *Aśvaka*; comp. MCCRINDLE, *Invasion of India*, p. 333.

³ The text of the passage is reproduced by TROYER, ii. p. 307. Another short quotation from the same text mentions the *Ariēnoi* along with the *Κασπεῖροι*.

time of this Dionysios. Nor is there any indication as to the source from which he may have taken the reference. That the Kaśmīris had abroad the reputation of being good pedestrians may be concluded from a remark of Albērūnī.¹ It is clear that the natural conditions of an alpine valley enclosed by difficult mountain ranges are likely to develop the marching powers of its inhabitants. The Rājatarāṅgiṇī gives us in fact several instances of very respectable marching performances. It shows at the same time the scant use made of riding animals in the mountains.² There is thus more than the mere name to justify us in referring the notice of Dionysios of Samos to Kaśmīr.

We meet with the name of the *Kaspeiroi* also in the Dionysiaka of Nonnos. There they are mentioned among the Indian tribes rising in arms against Bacchos.³ As Nonnos' list names in the same passage also the Ariēnoi whose name we see coupled with that of Kaspeiroi in the fragment of the Bassarika, it is probable that Nonnos has taken his reference either from the latter work or from some common source.

7. We should, indeed, have a far earlier reference to Kaśmīr in classical literature, and one by no less an authority than the 'Father of history,' if the opinion of those scholars could be accepted who

**Kaspatyros of
Herodotos.**

have thought to recognize the name of the Valley in the KASPATYROS of Herodotos. The facts are briefly the following. Herodotos mentions the city of Kaspatyros as the place at which the expedition under Scylax of Koryanda, sent by Darius to explore the course of the Indus, embarked.⁴ He distinctly places this city in the Paktyan land (Πακτυϊκὴ γῆ). This is described as being to the north of the other Indians and apparently bordering on the Baktrian territory. The place meant by Herodotos is evidently the same that Hekataios knew before him by the name of KASPAPYROS and as a city of the Gandarians.⁵

The notice of Hekataios (circ. 549-486 B.C.) makes it clear that Kaspatyros or Kaspapyros, whichever form may be more accurate, must have been situated in that territory where the Indus first becomes navigable, *i.e.*, in the ancient Gandhāra, the present Peshawar District. That the designation *Paktyikē* used by Herodotos refers to the same

¹ *India*, transl. Sachau, i. p. 206.

² Compare *Rājat.* vii. 140, 1301; viii. 192, 379, 1588, 1796, 1887, 2673 sq.

³ See *Dionysiaka*, xxvi. 165 sqq. I take this reference from TROYER, ii. p. 308.

⁴ See iv. 44, also iii. 102. The points bearing on the interpretation of the passage have been fully discussed by SIR E. H. BUNBURY, *History of Ancient Geography*, i. pp. 228, 256.

⁵ See Stephanos Byzant., s.v. ΓΑΝΔΑΡΙΚΗ; also Müller's *Fragmenta historic. graec.*, i. p. 12.

territory and represents the earliest mention of the ethnic name *Pakhtūn* or the modern Indian *Paṭhān*, seems also probable.¹ The exact site of Kaspatyros has not been identified. Considering the great changes which local nomenclature in Gandhāra has undergone, it perhaps never will be.²

WILSON was the first who distinctly attempted to connect the name of Kaspatyros with Kaśmīr.³ But the idea seems to have occurred earlier. For D'Anville thought it necessary to refer to it and to refute it. Wilson saw clearly enough that the city of Scylax must have been situated close to the Indus and hence far away from Kaśmīr. If notwithstanding this important fact he yet proposed to identify its name with that of Kaśmīr, on the assumption that the borders of the latter kingdom extended as far as the Indus, the mistake must be traced to a fanciful etymology of the latter name.

Wilson assumed that the name Kaśmīr was derived from **Kaśyapa-pura*, a name which he supposed to have been given to the country owing to its colonization by the Ṛṣi Kaśyapa. He supported this strange derivation by a reference to the uniform assertion of 'Oriental writers.'⁴ But it is difficult to believe that he could have meant any

¹ This identification seems to have been first made simultaneously by DORN and LASSEN; compare V. DE ST. MARTIN, *Étude sur la géographie grecque de l'Inde*, Mém. de l'Acad. des Inscriptions, Sav. Étrang., 1re Série, V., p. 17 sqq. His note on Kaspatyros, *ib.* pp. 81-86, contains a judicious review of the whole question from the geographical point of view and a detailed account of earlier opinions. For a more recent résumé compare DARMESTETER, *Chants Populaires des Afghans*, pp. clxxx sqq.

² Proper navigation begins now at Jahāngīra, a place situated on the left bank of the Kābul River, some six miles above the confluence of the latter with the Indus at Attock. The lower part of the Kābul River's course lies in a well-defined single bed which, in view of the natural configuration of the banks, cannot have changed materially in historical times. Above Jahāngīra the current becomes too strong for safe navigation.

I doubt very much whether the Indus immediately above Attock can ever have been suitable for proper navigation. The river is cut up there into many, often very shallow, channels and obstructed by continually shifting sandbanks. On the eastern bank spreads the low plain of Chach, which must have always left a wide scope to the vagaries of the great river. Taking into account these circumstances I should not be surprised if Scylax's expedition had chosen some place near Jahāngīra for the start on their voyage. There are many ruined sites near the latter place, and near Alladhēr closeby on the Indus.

³ See *Essay*, p. 117; for a reproduction of the argument, also, *Ariana Antiqua*, p. 136 sq.

⁴ "This (the name of Cashmir) was derived, it is uniformly asserted by the Oriental writers, from the colonization of the country by Casyapa, the first settlement or city being named after him Casyapapur, converted in ordinary pronuncia-

better authorities than the Persian *Tārīkhs* of Kaśmīr, of the 17th and 18th century, which he had occasion to consult in connection with his above-quoted Essay. They, indeed, indulge in whimsical etymologies like Kashmīr, *i.e.*, *Kashap* (Kaśyapa) + *mar* (maṭha), etc. But neither these etymologies nor the name **Kaśyapapura* are in any way known to our genuine sources.

Wilson would scarcely have chosen to put forth such a derivation, had the whole of the Chronicle or the other Kaśmirian texts been at the time accessible to him. Extensive as this literature is, it does not furnish any evidence whatever for **Kaśyapapura* or a similar name having ever been used as a designation of the country. This fact is all the more significant as allusions to the legendary origin of the country are otherwise so frequent. The philological impossibility of deriving Kaśmīra from **Kaśyapapura* need scarcely be specially indicated at the present day.¹ A reference to the theory was, however, here necessary, as it has found its way into works of authorities like Ritter, Lassen and Humboldt, and has hence been reproduced even by recent writers.²

SECTION II.—CHINESE RECORDS.

8. If classical literature has thus nothing to tell us of Kaśmīr but the bare name, it is very different with the Chinese records. Buddhist pilgrims from China on their way to the sacred sites of the Indian plains visited Kaśmīr and chose it as a resting place. Their itineraries as well as the records of the political relations established with Kaśmīr during a period of Chinese extension to the west, furnish us with a series of interesting data for the old geography of Kaśmīr.

It seems difficult to ascertain from the materials at present accessible in translations or notices of European scholars, which is to be considered the earliest Chinese reference to Kaśmīr. The difficulty is connected with the use of the geographical term *Ki-pin*. This name

tion into Cashappur or Caspapur, the latter of which forms is the proper reading of the Greek text;” *Essay*, p. 117.

¹ It is curious to note that *Kāśyapapura* was, according to an Indian authority quoted by Albērūnī, *India*, transl. Sachau, i. p. 298, one of the old names of Multān.

² See RITTER, *Erdkunde*, ii. p. 1087; LASSEN, *Ind. Alt.*, ii. p. 635 (where for **Kaśyapapura* > *Kaśmīra* an equally unfounded derivation from **Kaśyapamīra* is substituted); HUMBOLDT, *Asie Centrale*, i. p. 102; for modern works, *e.g.*, MCCRINDLE, *Ancient India*, p. 108; Beal, *Si-yu-ki*, i. p. 148.

originally and properly designated the Upper Kābul Valley.¹ It appears, however, at a period when Chinese knowledge of India was less developed, to have been used in a vague and general fashion for a variety of territories on the northern confines of India, among them also Kāsmīr. However this may be, our loss seems scarcely to be great, as these notices of the Chinese Annualists regarding Ki-pin do not seem to give characteristic local details.²

The first clear reference to Kāsmīr which I can trace at present, is contained in a record dating from 541 A.D. It is taken from the account of an Indian envoy who reached China during the early part of the reign of the T'ang dynasty.³ The name of Kāsmīr is not mentioned. Yet it is evident that M. PAUTHIER who published the extract, was right in referring to Kāsmīr the description given of the northern portion of India as a country "situated at the foot of the snowy mountains and enveloped by them on all sides like a precious jewel. In the south there is a valley which leads up to it and serves as the gate of the kingdom." The points noticed here are exactly those with which we meet in all Chinese accounts of Kāsmīr.

9. Ninety years after the date of this notice Kāsmīr was visited by

**Visit of Hiuen
Tsiang.**

HIUEN TSIANG. He reached the Valley from Uraśā in the west and resided in it as an honoured guest for fully two years. The records of the great Chinese pilgrim contain by far the fullest and most accurate description of Kāsmīr that has come down to us from a foreign pen during the period with which we are here concerned.⁴

Hiuen Tsiang must have entered Kāsmīr by the valley of the Vitastā as he describes his route as leading to the south-east of Uraśā, the present Hazāra District. After 'crossing over mountains and treading along precipices' he arrived at the 'stone gate which is the western entrance of the kingdom.' We shall see below that this gate known also to Ou-k'ong and Albērūnī, was the frontier watch-station or *Dvāra* in the gorge of Bārāmūla (Varāhamūla). He passed the first night on Kāsmīr soil at *Huṣkapura*, the modern Uṣkūr, opposite Bārāmūla. Thence he proceeded to the capital which he describes

¹ Compare the explanations of Messrs. Lévi and Chavannes in their paper '*L'itinéraire d'Ou-k'ong*, *Journal asiatique*, 1895, vi. pp. 371 *sqq.*, together with the supplementary and modifying statements, *ib.*, 1896, vii. pp. 161 *sq.*

² These notices are enumerated by Messrs. Lévi and Chavannes, *Journal asiat.*, 1895, vi. pp. 378 *sq.*

³ G. PAUTHIER, *Examen méthodique des faits qui concernent le Thian-Tchou ou l'Inde*, Paris, 1839, p. 40.

⁴ See *Si-yu-ki*, transl. Beal, i. pp. 148 *sqq.*; *Life of Hiuen Tsiang*, transl. Beal, pp. 68 *sqq.*

exactly in the position of the present Srinagar. There he was lodged in the convent known as the *Jayendravihāra* which is named also in the *Rājatarāṅgiṇī*.¹ A two years' stay, though chiefly passed in the study of 'the Sūtras and Sāstras', must have enabled Hiuen Tsiang to acquaint himself thoroughly with the Valley.

His description of the kingdom *Kia-shi-mi-lo* shows clearly that the geographical application of the term Kaśmīr must have been then, exactly as now, restricted to the great basin of the Vitastā and the side valleys drained by its tributaries above the Bārāmūla defile. He notices that the country is enclosed on all sides by mountains which are very high. "Although the mountains have passes through them, these are narrow and contracted." These natural bulwarks protected the country from neighbouring states 'which had never succeeded in subduing it.' Though the climate is cold and the snow plentiful, the soil is fertile and abounds with fruits and flowers. The inhabitants seem to have changed as little as the soil since Hiuen Tsiang's days. It is still easy to recognize in them the people whom he describes as "light and frivolous, and of a weak, pusillanimous disposition. The people are handsome in appearance, but they are given to cunning. They love learning and are well-instructed."

"Since centuries learning had been held in great respect in this kingdom." Hiuen Tsiang dwells with evident pleasure on the recollection of the learned conferences he had with the Kaśmīr doctors of the sacred law.² Kaśmīr had in earlier times played a great part in the traditions of the Buddhist church. Hiuen Tsiang relates at length the legends how the Arhat Madhyāntika had first spread the law of Buddha in the land; how in the time of Aśoka the five hundred Arhats had taken up their abode there; and how finally under the great Kanīṣka, king of Gandhāra, Kaśmīr had been the scene of the universal Council which fixed and expounded the Sacred Canon. Yet he observes that in his own time the kingdom as a whole was "not much given to the faith, and that the temples of the heretics were their sole thought."³

It is probably owing to this not very flourishing condition of contemporary Buddhism that Hiuen Tsiang mentions only a comparatively small number of Vihāras and Stūpas in the Valley. Among the Stūpas there were four ascribed to Aśoka. Beneath another Kanīṣka was believed to have deposited the canonical texts as fixed by his Council, engraved on sheets of copper. None of these structures have yet been

¹ Compare note iii. 355.

² See *Life*, p. 71 sq.

³ See *Si-yu-ki*, i. p. 158.

identified with any certainty. But in their description the pilgrim furnishes us incidentally with a valuable topographical indication.

Speaking of the convent which prided itself on the possession of a miraculous tooth of Buddha, he indicates its site as being about 10 *li* (circ. 2 miles) to the south-east of the new city and to the north of the old city.¹ This proves that the capital of Hiuen Tsiang's time which corresponds to the present Śrīnagar, was then a comparatively new foundation, exactly as the Chronicle's account has it. At the same time the reference to the 'old city' enables us to fix with absolute certainty the earlier capital of Śrīnagarī at the present *Pāndrēṭhan*, the *Purāṇā-dhiṣṭhāna* of Kalhaṇa.²

The two full years which Hiuen Tsiang, according to his own statement spent in Kaśmīr,³ represent a longer halt than any which the pious traveller allowed himself during his sixteen year's wanderings through the whole of India and Central Asia.⁴ With all due respect for the spiritual fervour of the pilgrim and the excellence of his Kaśmīrian preceptors, it is difficult to suppress the surmise that the material attractions of the Valley had something to do with his long stay. The cool air of Kaśmīr, the northern aspect of its scenery and products, have at all times exercised their powerful charm over those visitors who themselves born in colder climes have come to the Valley from the heat and dust of the Indian plains. Just as these advantages attract in yearly increasing numbers European visitors from India Proper, so the modern Turkī pilgrims from Kashgar, Yarkand and other parts of Central Asia, whether on the way to Mecca or on their return, never fail to make a long stay in Kaśmīr.

We should undoubtedly find the example of the modern Ḥājīs followed also by Buddhist pilgrims if there were still any from those northern regions to take their way through Kaśmīr to the holy places of India. It would be an interesting task to examine to what extent the fame of Kaśmīr as the 'paradis terrestre des Indes,' is the creation of the Valley's northern visitors, both European and Asiatic. Here it may suffice to add that Hiuen Tsiang before he reached Kaśmīr, must have had already his experience of the torrid heat and the other amenities of a Panjāb summer.⁵ We shall also see that the example of the other Chinese pilgrim whom we are able to follow on his visit to Kaśmīr, points exactly to the same conclusion.

¹ *Si-yu-ki*, i. p. 158.

² See below §§ 88, 89.

³ See *Life*, p. 72.

⁴ Compare the table of dates for Hiuen Tsiang's itinerary, CUNNINGHAM, *Ancient Geography*, pp. 563 sqq.

⁵ See CUNNINGHAM, *Ancient Geography*, p. 563 sq.

Hiuen Tsiang's narrative tells us that he left the Valley going in a south-westerly direction. He reached *Pun-nu-tso*, the Parṇotsa of the Chronicle and the modern Prūnt̄s, after crossing mountains and passing precipices.¹ As the Tōṣ²maidān route is the direct and most frequented route to that territory, it is very probable that Hiuen Tsiang also followed it. Parṇotsa as well as Rājapurī (Ho-lo-she-pu-lo) to which the pilgrim subsequently proceeded, had at the time of his visit no independent ruler, but were subject to Kaśmīr.

10. The next Chinese notice of Kaśmīr, and one which is of considerable historical interest, is contained in the **T'ang Annals.** Annals of the T'ang dynasty.² They inform us that the first embassy from Kaśmīr arrived at the imperial court in or shortly after A.D. 713. In the year 720 *Tchen-t'o-lo-pi-li*, ruler of Kaśmīr, the Candrāpīḍa of the Chronicle, was accorded by imperial decree the title of king.

His brother and successor *Mou-to-pi* in whom Kalhaṇa's Muktāpīḍa or Lalitāditya has long ago been recognised, sent after the first Chinese expedition against *Po-liu* or Baltistān (between 736 and 747) an envoy called *Ou-li-to* to the Chinese court. He was to report the alleged victories of his master over the Tibetans but at the same time also to solicit the establishment of a camp of Chinese troops by the banks of the lake *Mo-ho-to-mo-loung* (the Mahāpadma Nāga or Volur lake). The Kaśmīr king offered to provide all necessary supplies for an auxiliary force of 200,000 men. But the 'Divine Khān' found it more convenient to content himself with issuing decrees for the sumptuous entertainment of the ambassador and for the registration of Muktāpīḍa with the title of king. Since that time the relations of Kaśmīr with the celestial empire and the receipts of tribute from the former are said to have continued without interruption.

The description of Kaśmīr which is coupled with this record of the T'ang Annals, appears to be in the main copied from Hiuen Tsiang's *Si-yu-ki*. But in addition it furnishes us with an exact statement as to the Kaśmīr capital at that time. In my *Notes on Ou-k'ong's Account of*

¹ *Si-yu-ki*, i. p. 162 *Life* p. 72.

² The notice was first made known by A. RÉMUSAT's translation of the corresponding extract in Matuanlin's encyclopædia; see *Nouveaux Mélanges asiatiques*, Paris, 1829, i. pp. 196 sqq. An abstract of the same notice, but from the original text of the Annals, where the names are more correctly rendered, will be found in Messrs. LÉVI and CHAVANNES' *L'Itinéraire d'Ou-k'ong*, *Journal asiat.*, 1895, vi. pp. 354 sqq.

From REINAUD, *Mémoire sur l'Inde*, pp. 189 sq. it would appear that the names of Kaśmīr kings in this Chinese record and that of the Mahāpadma lake were first correctly identified by KLAPROTH, *Mémoires relatifs à l'Asie*, ii. pp. 275 sq. This work is at present not accessible to me.

*Kaśmīr*¹ I have shown that the *Po-lo-ou-lo-po-lo* of the Annals is a correct reproduction of *Pravarapura*, the old and official name of S'rī-nagara. In the same way the name *Mi-na-si-to* given to the great river which flows to the west of the capital, represents a correct enough transcription of *Vitastā*. Both the names are recorded in the form which they bore in the official Sanskrit, and are, therefore, evidently taken from the information given by the Kaśmīr envoys.

11. Not many years after Muktāpīḍa's embassy Kaśmīr was visited by another Chinese pilgrim, OU-K'ONG. Though greatly inferior to Hiuen Tsiang in learning and power of observation, he has yet left us information regarding the country which is of interest and value. The itinerary of Ou-k'ong the discovery and recent publication of which we owe to Messrs. Lévi and Chavannes,² contains the reminiscences of forty years' wanderings, taken down after the pilgrim's return to China and in a form regrettably brief. But whether it be due to Ou-k'ong's long stay in Kaśmīr or to other causes, his account is fortunately far more detailed in the case of Kaśmīr than in that of any other territory visited by him. His description of the Valley and the several sites mentioned by him have been fully discussed by me in the separate paper already quoted.³ I need hence indicate here only the main results of this analysis.

Ou-k'ong reached Kaśmīr in the year 759 from Gandhāra, presumably by the same route as Hiuen Tsiang had followed. He took there the final vows of a Buddhist monk and spent there fully four years engaged, as his itinerary tells us, in pilgrimages to holy sites and in the study of Sanskrit.⁴ Though he is said to have studied from day-break till night-fall, his diligence does not seem to have brought him much literary culture. This is curiously shown by the popular Apabhramśa forms in which our pilgrim records the names of the monasteries he specially singles out for notice. Four of these I have been able to identify with Vihāras mentioned in the Chronicle,⁵ and two of them have left their names to villages which survive to the present day.

¹ See pp. 26 *sqq.* in the above-quoted paper, published in the "Proceedings" of the Imperial Academy, Vienna (Philos.-histor. Class), 1896, vol. cxxxv.

² See *L' Itinéraire d'Ou-k'ong*, Journal asiat., 1895, vi. pp. 341 *sqq.*

³ See *Notes on Ou-k'ong's account of Kaśmīr*, *loc. cit.*

⁴ See *L' Itinéraire d'Ou-k'ong*, p. 356.

⁵ Thus the monastery of *Ngo-mi-t'o-p'o-wan* (**Amitabhavana*) corresponds to the *Amṛtabhavana* Vihāra of Rājat. iii. 9, which has given its name to the present *Āntabavan* near S'rīnagar. The 'monastère du mont *Ki-tché*, (**Kicā* < Skr. *krtyā*) is no other than the *Kṛtyāśrama* Vihāra, at the modern village *Kiṭṣāhōm*, the legend of which is related at length by Kālhaṇa, i. 131 *sqq.* The Vihāra of the great king *Moung-ti* (**Mutti*) was one of Muktāpīḍa's foundations, probably the *Mukta-

While Hiuen Tsiang mentions only about one hundred convents in the country, Ou-k'ong found more than three hundred and speaks in addition of the number of Stūpas and sacred images as considerable. We may conclude from this that there had been a rise in the popularity of Buddhism in the century intervening between the visits of the two pilgrims.

Ou-k'ong describes the kingdom of Kaśmīr correctly enough as enclosed on all sides by mountains which form its natural ramparts. Only three roads have been opened through them, and these again are secured by gates. In the east a road leads to *T'ou-fan* or Tibet; in the north there is a road which reaches into *Poliu* or Baltistān; the road which starts from 'the western gate' goes to *K'ien-t'o-lo* or Gandhāra.¹

We have here a clear enough description of the great routes through the mountains which since ancient times have formed the main lines of communication between the Valley and the outer world. The road to *T'ou-fan* corresponds undoubtedly to the present route over the *Zoji-Lā* to Ladākh and hence to Tibet. The road to *Po-liu* is represented by the present "Gilgit Road," leading into the Upper Kiṣangaṅgā Valley and thence to Skardo or Astōr on the Indus. The third road can be no other than the route which leaves the Valley by the gorge of Bārāmūla and follows the Vitastā in its course to the west. We have seen already that Hiuen Tsiang followed it when he entered Kaśmīr by 'the stone gate, the western entrance of the kingdom.' There can be doubt that in the gates (*fermetures*) closing these roads we have a reference to the ancient frontier watch-stations of which we find so frequent mention in our Kaśmīrian records.

Besides these three roads Ou-k'ong knew yet a fourth. "This, however, is always closed and opens only when an imperial army honours it with a visit." It is probable that this curious notice must be referred to one of the roads leading over the Pīr Panṭṣāl range to the south. Owing possibly to political causes these routes may have been closed to ordinary traffic at the time of Ou-k'ong's visit.²

The political relations between China and the northern kingdoms of India seem to have ceased soon after the time of Ou-k'ong. This was probably due to the Chinese power under the later T'ang gradually losing ground in Central Asia before the Uigurs and the Tibetans. The

vihāra at Huṣkapura: Uṣkūr, iv. 188. In the 'monastère du général (*tsiang-kiun*)' it is easy to recognize the Vihāra of the Turk (Tuḥkhāra) *Caṅkuṇa* who was one of Muktāpīḍa's ministers. He is reported to have founded two monasteries called after his own name (iv. 211, 215).

¹ See *L' Itinéraire d' Ou-k'ong*, p. 356.

² See *Notes on Ou-k'ong*, p. 24 sq.

pilgrimages, however, of Chinese Buddhists to India continued during the next two centuries, and of one at least of these pilgrim parties it is recorded that it took the route through Kaśmīr.¹ But no detailed account bearing on Kaśmīr has yet come to light of these later pilgrimages.

SECTION III.—MUHAMMADAN NOTICES.

12. After the Greeks and the Chinese the early Muhammadan writers are our next foreign informants regarding the historical geography of India. If with one very remarkable exception they have nothing to tell us of Kaśmīr topography, the explanation is not far to seek. The first rush of Arab invasion in the Indus Valley during the eighth century had carried the Muhammadan arms at times close enough to the confines of Kaśmīr.² No permanent conquest, however, had been effected even in the plains of the Northern Panjāb. Protected in the West by the unbroken resistance of the Sāhis of Kābul and in the South by a belt of war-like Hindu hill-states, Kaśmīr had never been seriously threatened. Even when Islām at last after a long struggle victoriously over-spread the whole of Northern India, Kaśmīr behind its mountain ramparts remained safe for centuries longer.

Conquest and trade were the factors which brought so large a part of the ancient world within the ken of the early Muhammadan travelers and geographers. Both failed them equally in the case of Kaśmīr. For a classical witness shows us that a system of seclusion,—ever easy to maintain in a country so well guarded by nature as Kaśmīr,—hermetically sealed at that time the Valley to all foreigners without exception.

Even the well-informed Al-Mas'ūdī who had personally visited the Indus Valley, is unable to tell us more about Kaśmīr than that it is a kingdom with many towns and villages enclosed by very high and inaccessible mountains, through which leads a single passage closed by a gate.³ The notices we find in the works of Al-Qazwīnī and Al-Idrīsī are practically restricted to the same brief statement. The references in other geographical works are even more succinct and vague.⁴

¹ Compare YULE, *Cathay*, p. lxxi., and JULIEN, *Journal asiat.*, 1847, p. 43.

² See REINAUD, *Mémoire sur l'Inde*, pp. 195 sq.; ALBĒRŪNĪ, *India*, i. p. 21.

³ See Al-Mas'ūdī's "Meadows of Gold," transl. Sprenger, i. p. 382.

⁴ The silence of the early Muhammadan geographers as regards Kaśmīr was duly noticed by RITTER, *Asia*, ii. p. 1115.—For Al-Qazwīnī, see GILDEMEISTER, *De rebus Indicis*, p. 210; for Al-Idrīsī, ELLIOT, *History of India*, i. pp. 90. sq.

For the notices of other Arab geographers, see *Bibliotheca geographorum*

13. Notwithstanding the circumstances above indicated, Arabic literature furnishes us with a very accurate and valuable account of old Kaśmīr. We owe it to the research and critical penetration of ALBĒRŪNĪ of whom indeed it might be said as of an early British explorer of Afghānistān,¹ that he could look through the mountains. The great Muhammadan scholar had evidently utilized every opportunity during his long stay at Ghazna and in the Panjāb, (A.D. 1017–30) for collecting information on Kaśmīr.

His interest in the distant alpine valley is easily understood. He, himself, tells us in the first chapter of his great work on India, how Hindu sciences when the victories of Maḥmūd had made the Hindus 'like atoms of dust scattered in all directions,' had retired far away from the conquered parts of the country. They "fled to places which our hand cannot yet reach, to Kaśmīr, Benares and other places."² In another passage he speaks again of Benares and Kaśmīr as the high schools of Hindu sciences.³ He repeatedly refers to Kaśmīrian authors, and from the notices shown below it is evident that among his informants, if not among his actual teachers, there were Kaśmīrian scholars.⁴

The curious fact that Albērūnī himself composed some Sanskrit treatises for circulation among 'the people of Kaśmīr,'⁵ proves beyond all

arabiorum, ed. De Goeje, i. p. 4; ii. pp. 9, 445; v. p. 364; vi. pp. 5, 18, 68; vii. pp. 89, 687; also *Abū-l-Fidā*, ed. Reinaud, pp. 361, 506.

¹ Mountstuart Elphinstone.

² ALBĒRŪNĪ'S *India*, transl. Sachau, i. p. 22.

³ *India*, i. p. 173.

⁴ Albērūnī, ii. 181, refers particularly to Kaśmīrian informants with whom he conversed regarding the miracle of the 'Kūdaishahr,' i.e., the *Kapateśvara* Tīrtha (see below § 112). The way in which the pilgrimage to this spot was described to Albērūnī, makes it quite certain that his informants were personally familiar with the Tīrtha. The same must be said of his note on the pilgrimage to the temple of Sārādā (i. 117; see below § 127). The details regarding a local Kaśmīr festival (ii. p. 178), the anecdote about the propagation of the *Sīsyahitāvṛtti* in Kaśmīr (i. 135), are such as could not well have reached Albērūnī otherwise but by verbal communication.

Writing himself in A.D. 1030 he refers to a statement contained in the almanac for the Śaka year 951 (A.D. 1029–30) 'which had come from Kashmīr' (i. p. 391). He could scarcely have secured such an almanac except through Kaśmīrian Paṇḍits who even at the present day, wherever they may be, make it a point to provide themselves from home with their local *nakṣatrapattrikā*.

For references to Kaśmīrian authors or texts specially connected with Kaśmīr, see i. pp. 126, 157, 298, 334, i. p. 54 (*Viṣṇudharma*), etc. Compare also the very detailed account of the calendar reckoning current in Kaśmīr and the conterminous territories, ii. p. 8.

⁵ See *India*, Prof. Sachau's preface, p. xxiv., and the introduction to his edition of the text, p. xx.

doubt the existence of special relations between the great *Mleccha* scholar and that jealously guarded country. These relations seem strange considering what Albērūnī himself tells us so graphically about the rigid isolation of Kaśmīr. We can scarcely explain them otherwise than by personal intercourse with Kaśmīrian Pandits.

In view of these indications we can hardly go wrong in attributing a great portion of Albērūnī's detailed knowledge of Kaśmīr topography to these learned informants. But we also know that the chances of war had given him an opportunity of supplementing this knowledge in part by personal observation. Albērūnī refers in two places to his personal acquaintance with the fortress *Lauhūr* (or *Lahūr*) on the confines of Kaśmīr. In an extract from my commentary on the *Rājataranṅiṇī* already published,¹ I have proved that Albērūnī's *Lauhūr* is identical with the castle of *Lohara*, so frequently mentioned in the Chronicle. Its position is marked by the present *Lohārīn* on the southern slope of the *Pir Pantṣāl* range.

'*Loharakoṭṭa*' is undoubtedly the same as the Fort of *Lōh-kōt* which according to the uniform report of the Muhammadan historians brought Maḥmūd's attempt at an invasion of Kaśmīr to a standstill. It is hence certain that Albērūnī had accompanied this unsuccessful expedition. It probably took place in A.D. 1021. Though it failed to reach Kaśmīr, it must have given Albērūnī ample opportunity to collect local information and to acquaint himself with the topography of those mountain regions which formed Kaśmīr's strongest bulwark to the south. The result is yet clearly traceable in the accuracy with which he describes the relative position of the most prominent points of this territory.

Is it too much to suppose that Albērūnī had at one time or the other Kaśmīrian Paṇḍits in his employ? We know that in preparing the vast materials digested in his book he worked largely with the help of indigenous scholars. Judging from his own description of the state of Hindu sciences in the conquered territories and the bitter enmity prevailing there against the dominant *Mlecchas*, it is doubtful whether he could have secured there such assistance as he required.

Albērūnī himself, when describing the difficulties in the way of his Indian studies, tells us (i. p. 24): "I do not spare either trouble or money in collecting Sanskrit books from places where I supposed they were likely to be found, and in procuring for myself, even from very remote places, Hindu scholars who understand them and are able to teach me."

Kaśmīr has always been distinguished by an over-production of learning. Its Paṇḍits have been as ready in old days as at present to leave their homes for distant places wherever their learning secured for them a livelihood (compare BÜHLER, *Introd. to the Vikramāṅkadevacarita*, p. xvii; also *Indische Palæographie*, p. 56).

¹ See my note on the '*Castle of Lohara*,' *Indian Antiquary*, 1897, pp. 225 sqq., or Note *E*, on *Rājat.* iv. 177, §§ 12, 13.

14. Albērūnī's main account of Kaśmīr is contained in Chapter xviii. which gives 'various notes on the countries of the Hindus, their rivers and their ocean.'¹ Compared with the description of the rest of India, it is disproportionately detailed. Albērūnī first sketches in broad but correct outlines the political division of the mountain region which lies between the great Central Asian watershed and the Panjāb plain. He then refers to the pedestrian habits of the Kaśmīrians and notes the use by the nobles of palankins carried on the shoulders of men, a custom fully illustrated by the Chronicle and accounted for by the nature of the communications in the mountains.²

What follows deserves full quotation. "They are particularly anxious about the natural strength of their country, and therefore take always much care to keep a strong hold upon the entrances and roads leading into it. In consequence it is very difficult to have any commerce with them. In former times they used to allow one or two foreigners to enter their country, particularly Jews, but at present they do not allow any Hindu whom they do not know personally to enter, much less other people."

We have here a full and clear statement of that system of guarding all frontier-passes which we have found alluded to already in the Chinese records. It explains the great part which is played in the Kaśmīr Chronicles by the frontier watch-stations, the *Dvāras* and *Draṅgas*. It is of all the more interest as the last traces of the system, in the form of *rāhdārī*, have disappeared in Kaśmīr only within quite recent memory.³

Albērūnī then proceeds to describe the 'best known entrance to Kaśmīr.' Though the starting point of his itinerary cannot be identified with absolute certainty, it is clear that he means the route which ascends the Jehlam Valley. From "the town *Babrahān*, half way between the rivers Sindh (Indus) and Jailam, 8 farsakh are counted to the bridge over the river where the water of the *Kusnārī* is joined by that of the *Mahwī*, both of which come from the mountains of *Shamīlān* and fall into the Jailam." Though there seems to be here some slight confusion, I have little doubt that the point meant by 'the bridge over the river' corresponds to the present Muẓaffarābād, at the confluence

¹ See *India*, i. pp. 206 *sqq.*

² Compare e.g. *Rājat*. iv. 407; v. 33, 219; vii. 478; viii. 2298, 2636, 2674, 3165, etc.

The word *katt* which Albērūnī gives as the indigenous term of the palankin, is perhaps a corrupted Apabhraṁśa form of *karnīratha*, often named in the *Rājat*.

³ Compare my *Notes on the Ancient Topography of the Pīr Panṭāl Route*, J. A. S. B., 1895, pp. 382 *sqq.*; also below § 40.

of the Jehlam and Kiṣangaṅgā. The easiest route to Kaśmīr from the west leads through the open central portion of Hazāra (Uraśā) to Mansahra; hence across the Kunhār and Kiṣangaṅgā rivers to Muḏaffarābād, and then up by the right side of the Jehlam Valley to Bārāmūla.¹ In *Kusnārī* it is easy to recognize with Prof. Sachau the present Kunhār River which falls into the Jehlam a few miles below its great bend at Muḏaffarābād.² The Mahwī is evidently meant to designate the Kiṣangaṅgā.³ If thus interpreted the only error in Albērūnī's description is that it makes the Kunhār join the Kiṣangaṅgā whereas in reality it falls into the Jehlam after the latter's junction with the Kiṣangaṅgā.

I have shown in my note on Rājat. v. 215 that the route here indicated, which was a favorite one until the modern "Jehlam Valley Tonga Road" was constructed, is distinctly referred to already in Kalhaṇa's account of Śamkaravarman's march to and from Uraśā. The distance of 8 farsakh corresponds according to Albērūnī's reckoning to about 39 English miles.⁴ Referring to the map and the modern route measurements⁵ this distance carries us to a point between Mansahra and the next stage Abbottabad, *i.e.*, exactly into the neighbourhood where according to the evidence given in the above-quoted note the old capital of Uraśā must be located. 'Babrahān' which cannot be identified at present, is perhaps intended to represent the name of this old town which could fairly be described as situated midway between the Indus and Jehlam.

From Muḏaffarābād onwards,—where there is still a bridge over the Kiṣangaṅgā just as at the time (1783) when Forster crossed here on his way from Kaśmīr to Attock,⁶ and as, if our explanation is right, in the time of Albērūnī,—we can follow the route quite plainly. Albērūnī counts five days of march "to the beginning of the ravine whence the

¹ This route is described, *e.g.*, by DREW, *Jummoo*, p. 528, 'as the easiest route from the Panjāb to Kaśmīr.'

² *Kunhār* represents the regular phonetic derivative of a Skr. **Kusnārī*, medial ś becoming always *h* under a phonetic law common to Kaśmīrī and the related dialects; for the change *hn* > *nh* compare GRIERSON, *Phonology of Indo-Aryan Vernaculars*, Z. D. M. G., 1896, p. 33.

³ I am unable to account for the name *Mahwī*. Could it be the corruption of an Apabhraṃśa derivative of *Madhumatī*? This name, though properly applied to an affluent of the Kiṣangaṅgā, is used in a Māhātmya also for the latter river itself; see Note B, Rājat. i. 37, § 16.

⁴ Compare Prof. Sachau's note, *India*, ii. p. 316. Albērūnī values his *farsakh* at 4 Arabian miles or approximately 4×2186 yards. Hence $1 \text{ farsakh} = 4\frac{17}{76}\frac{1}{3}$ English miles.

⁵ See DREW, *loc. cit.*

⁶ See G. FORSTER, *Journey from Bengal to England*, 1808, ii: p. 46.

river Jailam comes,' that is, of the gorge through which the river flows immediately below Bārāmūla. This estimate agrees closely with the actual road distance between Muẓaffarābād and Bārāmūla which is given by Drew as 84 miles.¹ At the other or Kaśmīr end of the ravine Albērūnī places quite correctly 'the watch-station *Dvār*' (Skr. *Dvāra*) the position of which, as we shall see below, is marked to this day by the site of the old gate known as *Drang*.

“Thence leaving the ravine you enter the plain, and reach in two more days *Addishtān*, the capital of Kashmīr, passing on the road the village *Ūshkārā*.” All this is perfectly accurate. *Adhiṣṭhāna* 'the capital' is, of course, meant for *Srīnagara*² and *Ūshkārā* for *Uṣkūr*, opposite Bārāmūla, the ancient *Huṣkapura* already mentioned by Hiuen Tsiang.³ Albērūnī's mention of *Uṣkūr* which is on the left river bank, shows that then as now the ordinary road from the 'Gate of *Varāhamūla*' to *Srīnagara* passed on the left or southern side of the Valley. Two marches are still counted for this part of the journey.

The capital is correctly described as “being built along both banks of the river Jailam which are connected with each other by bridges and ferry boats.” It is said to cover 'a space of four *farsakh*.' This if interpreted to mean 'a space of four *Farsakh* in circumference,' would not be too far from the truth, assuming that all suburban areas around the city are included in the estimate. The course of the river above and below the capital is traced rightly enough as far as the Valley is concerned. “When the Jailam has left the mountains and has flowed two days' journey, it passes through *Addishtān*. Four *Farsakh* farther on it enters a swamp of one square *Farsakh*.” Here, of course, the *Volur* lake (*Mahāpadma*) is meant. “The people have their plantations on the borders of this swamp, and on such parts of it as they manage to

¹ See *loc. cit.* According to Drew's table six marches are counted, but one of them is very short. On the modern route following the opposite side of the river five marches are now reckoned from *Domēl*, opposite to *Muẓaffarābād*, to *Bārāmūla*.

² *Adhiṣṭhāna*, used again ii. p. 181, is a term which indicates that Albērūnī's informant was a Sanskrit-speaking person. The common designation of the capital was *Srīnagara* or simply *Nagara*; see § 91 below.

³ The text as rendered by Prof. Sachau, speaks of “*Ūshkārā* which lies on both sides of the Valley, in the same manner as *Barāmūlā*.” There is either some corruption in the text here or Albērūnī's informant had not made himself sufficiently clear. What he must have meant, is that *Ūshkārā* lay on the opposite side of the river in the same manner as *Barāmūlā*, that is at the entrance of the ravine. *Barāmūlā* as the text spells the name, reproduces an earlier form of the Kaśmīrī *Varahmul*, from Skr. *Varāhamūla*.

reclaim. Leaving this swamp, the Jailam passes the town of Ūshkārā, and then enters the above-mentioned ravine.”

The only mistake and this one easily explained is contained in the account of the river's origin. It is described as rising “in the mountains *Haramakōt* where also the Ganges rises; cold, impenetrable regions where the snow never melts nor disappears.” It is easy to recognize here the reference to Mount *Haramukuṭa* and the sacred Gaṅgā-lake at the foot of its glacier in which Kāsmīrian tradition places the source of the Sindhu river.¹ The latter is the greatest tributary of the Vitastā within Kāsmīr and is traditionally identified with the Gaṅgā, as on the other hand the Vitastā with the Yamunā.² The special sanctity of the Sindhu (‘Uttaragaṅgā’) and the popularity of its supposed source as a pilgrimage place sufficiently account for the substitution in Albērūnī's notice.

Entering the open plain of the Kāsmīr Valley by the Bārāmūla gorge “you have for a march of two more days, on your left the mountains of Bolor and Shamīlān, Turkish tribes who are called *Bhattavaryān*. Their king has the title of *Bhatta-Shāh*.” It is clear that Albērūnī's informant here means the mountain ranges to the north and north-west of the Valley which form its borders towards the Dard country and Baltistān. The latter has been known by the name of Bolor for many centuries.³ I am unable to trace in Kāsmīrian or other sources the names of the ‘Shamīlān’ and ‘Bhatta.’⁴ But as a subsequent remark mentions ‘*Gilgit*, *Aswīra*, and *Shūtās*,’ that is the modern Gilgit, Hasōr (Astōr) and Cilās as their chief places, there can be no doubt that the inhabitants of the Dard territory to the north-west of Kāsmīr are meant together with the Baltīs.

**Description of Pīr
Pantsāl.**

“Marching on the right side [of the river], you pass through villages, one close to the other, south of the capital and thence you reach the mountain *Kulārjak*, which is like a cupola, similar to the

¹ See below, § 57, and *Rājat*. note i. 57.

² See *Rājat*. note i. 57. In *Haracar*. iv. 54 the Vitastā itself is designated as the ‘Gaṅgā of the north’ (Uttaragaṅgā). This renders the location of its source in the lake of Haramukuṭa still more intelligible from a traditional point of view.

³ Compare YULE, *Marco Polo*, i. pp. 187, sq.; CUNNINGHAM, *Anc. Geogr.*, p. 83.

⁴ Albērūnī's *Bhatta* may possibly represent the term *Bhuṭṭa* or *Bhauṭṭa* (the modern Kś. *Buṭa*) which is applied in the Sanskrit Chronicles to the population of Tibetan descent generally, from Ladākh to Baltistān. (See *Rājat*. note i. 312). Albērūnī calls their language Turkish, but it must be remembered that he has spoken previously (i. p. 206) of ‘the Turks of Tibet’ as holding the country to the east of Kāsmīr. There the Tibetans in Ladākh and adjacent districts are clearly intended.

mountain *Dunbāwand* (Damāwand). The snow there never melts. It is always visible from the region of Tākēshar and Lauhāwar (Lahore)."

I have already elsewhere shown that the mountain here described is the *Taṭakūṭī* peak ($33^{\circ} 45'$ lat. $74^{\circ} 33'$ long.).¹ It rises to a height of 15,500 feet in the central part of the Pīr Panṭsāl range and is the loftiest as well as the most conspicuous point of the mountain chain to the south of Kaśmīr. It has the shape described by Albērūnī, is surrounded by extensive snow-fields and can be seen through the greatest part of the year from the Panjāb districts of Siālkōt and Gujṛānwāla corresponding to the old Tākēshar (Ṭakkadeśa). Albērūnī puts the distance between this peak and the Kaśmīr plain at two farsakh. This estimate is somewhat too low, inasmuch as the direct distance on the map between the peak and the nearest point of the open Valley is about 15 miles.

He is, however, quite exact in placing the fortress *Lauhūr* to the west of it as we have already seen that this stronghold is identical with the *Loharakoṭṭa* of the Chronicle, the present Lohārin. The entrance to the Lohārin Valley lies almost due west of Taṭakūṭī. To the south of the peak he places 'the fortress *Rājagirī*' which is also mentioned by Kalhaṇa, vii. 1270, and must be looked for somewhere in the Upper Sūran Valley. Albērūnī speaks of these two hill fortresses as "the strongest places" he had ever seen.

He had personally had an opportunity of judging of their strength when accompanying Maḥmūd's expedition against Kaśmīr. On that occasion he had made the observation of the latitude of Lauhūr (Lohara) to which he refers in another chapter of his work.² The result of this observation, $33^{\circ} 40'$ lat. as shown in the author's Canon Masudicus, very closely approaches the real one, which is $33^{\circ} 48'$ according to the Survey map. It is very probable that he obtained at the same occasion the very accurate information regarding the distance from Lauhūr to the Kaśmīr capital. He gives it as 56 miles, "half the way being rugged country, the other half plain." Albērūnī's measurement according to the previously stated valuation represents about 69 English miles. This is but little in excess of the actual road distance viâ the Tōṣāmaidan pass as estimated by me on the tour referred to in the above-quoted paper. The description of the road, too, corresponds closely to the actual character of the route.

Albērūnī closes his account of Kaśmīr geography with a reference to the town of *Rājawarī* which is the *Rājapurī* of the Chronicles, the

¹ See my paper 'The Castle of Lohara,' *Ind. Ant.*, 1897, § 12.

² See *India*, i. p. 317, with Prof. Sachau's note ii. p. 341. In the same passage he quotes the latitude of S'rīnagar as $34^{\circ} 9'$ from the *Karaṇasāra*.

modern *Rajaurī*. In Hindu times it was the capital of a small hill-state situated immediately to the south of the Pir Pant̥sāl range and often tributary to Kāsmīr. Albērūnī distinctly names it as the farthest place to which Muhammadan merchants of his time traded and beyond which they never passed. We have already seen what the connection was which enabled him to collect reliable and detailed information of the region beyond that barrier. As another proof of the accurate knowledge thus acquired, we may finally mention his description of the Kāsmīr climate which is far more exact than any account available to us previous to the second quarter of this century.¹

SECTION IV.—INDIAN NOTICES.

15. Nothing, perhaps, can illustrate better the lamentable lack of exact geographical information in general Sanskrit literature than to turn from the accounts of the Chinese pilgrims and Albērūnī to what Indian authors, not Kāsmīrians themselves, can tell us of the Valley.

Deficiency of non-Kāsmīrian texts.

Were we to judge merely from the extreme scantiness of the data to be gleaned from their extant works, we might easily be led to assume that Kāsmīr was to them a country foreign and remote in every way. However, we observe the same vagueness and insufficiency of local references in the case of territories immediately adjoining the old centres of literary activity. It is hence evident that the conspicuous absence of useful information on Kāsmīr may equally well be attributed to the general character of that literature.

The name *Kāsmīra*, with its derivative *Kāsmīra*, as the designation of the country and its inhabitants, respectively, is found already in the *Gaṇas* to Pāṇini's grammar and in Patañjali's comments thereon.² The *Mahābhārata* too refers in several passages to the *Kāsmīras* and their rulers, but in a fashion so general and vague that nothing more but the situation of the country in the hill region to the north can be concluded therefrom.³

The *Purāṇas* enumerate the *Kāsmīras* accordingly in their lists of northern nations. But none of the tribal names, partly semi-mythical,

¹ See *India*, i. p. 211, and below, § 77.

² See the references in the *Thesaurus* of BÖHTLINGK-ROTH, s. v. *Kāsmīra*, and in supplement V., p. 1273. The references to other texts in this paragraph have also been taken from that work except where otherwise specified.

³ Compare in particular *Mahābh.* II. xxvii. 17.

which are mentioned along with them in the Purāṇas examined by me, indicate any more distinct location of the country.¹

Varāhamihira (circ. 500 A.D.) in his *Brhatsamhitā* includes the Kāśmīras curiously enough in the north-eastern division. Among the regions and peoples named under the same heading there are a number of purely legendary character like 'the kingdom of the dead' (*naṣṭa-rājya*), the 'gold region,' 'the one-footed people,' etc. But besides these names and others of a different type which cannot be clearly identified, we recognize the names of tribes which undoubtedly must be located in the immediate neighbourhood of Kaśmīr. Thus we have the *Abhisāras*, *Daradas*, *Dārvas*, *Khaśas*, *Kīras*, and somewhat more distant the country of *Kulūta* (Kulu) and the *Kauṇindas* or *Kaulindras* (Ptolemy's *Κυλινδρίνη*).²

Perhaps the most specific piece of information regarding Kaśmīr that Sanskrit literature outside the Valley can convey to us, is contained in the term *Kāśmīra* or *Kāśmīraja* which designates the saffron and according to the lexicographers also the root of the *kuṣṭha* or *costus speciosus*. Both the saffron and the Kuṣṭha have since early times been famous products of Kaśmīr.³

SECTION V.—THE KAS'MĪR CHRONICLES.

16. The want of detailed and exact geographical information just noticed in old Indian literature generally stands in striking contrast to the abundance of data supplied for our knowledge of old Kaśmīr by the indigenous sources. The explanation is surely not to be found in the mere fact that Kaśmīrian authors naturally knew more of their own country than others for whom that alpine territory was a distant, more or less inaccessible region. For were it so, we might reasonably expect to find ourselves equally well informed about the early topography of other

¹ Compare *Vāyupur.* xlv. 120; xlii. 45; *Padmapur.* I. vi. 48, 62; *Bhāgavatapur.* XII. i. 39; *Viṣṇupur.* IV. xxiv. 18.

² See *Brhatsamhitā*, xiv. 29 sqq., and *Ind. Ant.*, 1893, pp. 172, 181; also ALBĒRŪNĪ, *India*, i. p. 303.

³ Regarding the saffron cultivation of Kaśmīr, compare LAWRENCE, *Valley*, p. 342, and below, § 78.

The *kuṣṭha*, now known in Kaśmīr by the name of *kuṭh*, is the aromatic root of the *Saussurea Lappa* which grows in abundance on the mountains of Kaśmīr; see LAWRENCE, p. 77. The *kuṭh* is still largely exported to China and might be hence one of the medicinal plants which Hiuen Tsiang particularly notices among Kaśmīr products; see *Si-yu-ki*, i. p. 148.

parts of India which have furnished their contingent to the phalanx of Sanskrit authors. Yet unfortunately this is by no means the case.

The advantageous position we enjoy in Kaśmīr is due to a combination of causes of which the most important ones may at once be here indicated. In the first place we owe it to the preservation of connected historical records from a comparatively early date which acquaint us with a large number of particular localities and permit us to trace their connection with the country's history.

Another important advantage results from the fact that Kaśmīr, thanks chiefly to its geographical position and the isolation resulting from it, has escaped those great ethnic and political changes which have from time to time swept over the largest portion of India. Local tradition has thus remained undisturbed and still clings to all prominent sites with that tenacity which is characteristic of alpine tracts all over the world. The information preserved by this local tradition in Kaśmīr has often proved for our written records a most welcome supplement and commentary.

Finally it must be remembered that in a small mountain country like Kaśmīr, where the natural topographical features are so strongly marked and so permanent, the changes possible in historical times as regards routes of communication, sites for important settlements, cultivated area, etc., are necessarily restricted. The clear and detailed evidence which the facts of the country's actual topography thus furnish, enables us to elucidate and to utilize our earlier data, even where they are scanty, with far greater certainty and accuracy than would be possible on another ground. The observations here briefly indicated will be in part illustrated by the review of our Kaśmīrian sources.

17. Epigraphical records on stone or copper such as elsewhere in India form the safest basis for the study of local topography, have not yet come to light in Kaśmīr. The few fragmentary inscriptions hitherto found are all of a late date and do not furnish any topographical information. In their absence Kalhaṇa's Rājatarāṅgiṇī is not only the amplest but also the most authentic of our sources for the historical geography of Kaśmīr. The questions connected with the historical value of the work, its scope and sources, have been fully discussed in the introduction to my translation. Here we have only to consider its character as our chief source of information on the old topography of Kaśmīr.

KALHAṆA'S work, composed in the years 1148-49 A.D., is our oldest record of the history of the various dynasties which ruled Kaśmīr from the earliest period to the time of the author. The earlier Chronicles

which Kalhaṇa has used and quoted, have all been lost. We are hence unable to judge what he took from each, and how he worked up their contents. Largely legendary in the first three Books, his narrative reaches firm historical ground with the Kārkoṭa dynasty in the Fourth Book. From Avantivarman's reign (A.D. 855-883) onwards which opens the Fifth Taraṅga, the Chronicle may be considered an accurate and reliable historical record. As the author approaches his own time, his narrative grows more and more detailed.

In illustration of the latter fact it may be mentioned that of the whole work comprising nearly eight thousand Ślokas, more than one-half is devoted to the relation of the reigns which fill the century and a half immediately preceding the date of composition. We have certainly no reason to regret the fulness with which Books vii. and viii. relate the events of the author's own time and of the period that lay near it. From a historical point of view, Kalhaṇa's detailed account of contemporary history and the near past must always retain its value. We can appreciate its advantages also with special regard to the elucidation of the old topography of the country. This will become at once clear by a brief analysis of the topographical information contained in the Chronicle.

It is doubtful whether Kalhaṇa writing for readers of his own country and time, would have deemed it necessary to give us a connected and matter-of-fact description of the land, even if the literature which he knew and which was his guide, had furnished him with a model or suggestion for such a description. The nearest approach to it is contained in a brief passage of his introduction, i. 25-38. This acquaints us in a poetical form with the legends concerning the creation of Kaśmīr and its sacred river, the Vitastā, and enumerates besides the most famous of the many Tīrthas of which Kaśmīr has ever boasted in abundance. The few panegyric remarks which are added in praise of the land's spiritual and material comforts, i. 39-43, do credit to the author's love of his native soil. But they can scarcely be held to raise the above to a real description of the country.

18. Notwithstanding the absence of such a description Kalhaṇa's Chronicle yet proves by far our richest source of information for the historical geography of Kaśmīr. This is due to the mass of incidental notices of topographical interest which are spread through the whole length of the narrative. They group themselves conveniently under three main heads.

**Kalhaṇa's notices
of Tīrthas.**

Considering the great attention which the worship of holy places has at all times claimed in Kaśmīr, we may well speak first of the

notices which appertain to the *Topographia sacra* of the Valley. Kāsmīr has from early times to the present day been a land abundantly endowed with holy sites and objects of pilgrimages. Kalhaṇa duly emphasizes this fact when he speaks, in the above-quoted introductory passage, of Kāsmīr as a country 'where there is not a space as large as a grain of sesamum without a Tīrtha.'¹

Time and even the conversion to Islām of the great majority of the population has changed but little in this respect. For besides the great Tīrthas which still retain a fair share of their former renown and popularity, there is scarcely a village which has not its sacred spring or grove for the Hindu and its Ziārat for the Muhammadan. Established as the latter shrines almost invariably are, by the side of the Hindu places of worship and often with the very stones taken from them, they plainly attest the abiding nature of local worship in Kāsmīr.

This cannot be the place to examine in detail the origin and character of these Tīrthas and their importance for the religious history of the country. It will be enough to note that the most frequent objects of such ancient local worship are the springs or *Nāgas*, the sacred streams and rivers, and finally the so-called *svayambhū* or 'self-created' images of gods which are recognized by the eye of the pious in various natural formations. These several classes of Tīrthas can be traced throughout India wherever Hindu religious notions prevail, and particularly in the sub-Himalayan regions (Nepāl, Kumaon, Kāngra, Udyāna or Swāt). Still there can be no doubt that Kāsmīr has from old times claimed an exceptionally large share in such manifestations of divine favour.

Nature has indeed endowed the Valley and the neighbouring mountains with an abundance of fine springs. As each of these has its tutelary deity in the form of a *Nāga*,² we can easily realize why popular tradition looks upon Kāsmīr as the favourite residence of these deities.³ Hiuen Tsiang already had ascribed the superiority of Kāsmīr over other countries to the protection it received from a *Nāga*.⁴ Kalhaṇa, too, in his introduction gives due prominence to the distinction which the land

¹ i. 38.

² Compare my note i. 30 on the *Nāgas* and their worship.

³ The *Nīlamatapurāṇa*, 900-972, gives a long list of Kāsmīr *Nāgas* and puts their number at thousands, nay *Arbudas* (see 971).

⁴ *Si-yu-ki*, i. p. 148. Hiuen Tsiang, like other Chinese pilgrims, calls the *Nāgas* by the term of 'dragon;' no doubt because the popular conception represents them under the form of snakes living in the water of the springs or lakes they protect.

enjoys as the dwelling-place of *Nīla*, king of Nāgas, and of many other of his tribe.¹

Kalhana's frequent references to sacred springs and other Tirthas are of topographical interest, because they enable us to trace with certainty the earlier history of most of the popular pilgrimage places still visited to the present day. The list already mentioned acquaints us with the miraculous springs of *Pāpasūdana* and *Tri-Saṁdhyā*, *Sarasvatī's* lake on the *Bheḍa* hill, the 'Self-created Fire' (*Svayāmbhū*), and the holy sites of *Nandikṣetra*, *Sāradā*, *Cakradhara* and *Vijayēśa*. It shows which were the Tirthas most famous in Kalhana's time. The legends connected with the early semi-mythical kings give the chronicler frequent occasion in the first three Books to speak in detail of particular sacred sites. Almost each one of the stories furnishes evidence for the safe location of the latter.² But also in the subsequent and purely historical portions of the work we read often of pilgrimages to such sacred places or of events which occurred at them.

Kalhana shows more than once so accurate a knowledge of the topography of particular Tirthas that his personal visits to them may be assumed with great probability. This presumption is particularly strong in the case of *Nandikṣetra* which his father Canpaka is said to have often visited as a pilgrim and to have richly endowed, and of the neighbouring shrine of *Bhūteśvara*.³ Also the distant Tirtha of *Sāradā* in the *Kiṣangaṅgā* Valley seems to have been known personally to the Chronicler.⁴ Considering the popularity which pilgrimages to sacred sites have always enjoyed among Kaśmīrians, the conclusion seems justified that Kalhana owed perhaps no small part of his practical acquaintance with his country's topography, to the tours he had made as a pilgrim.

19. A second fruitful source of valuable topographical notices is contained in those very numerous references which Kalhana makes to the foundation of towns, villages, estates, shrines, and buildings by particular kings. If we leave aside the curious list, i. 86-100, taken by

¹ *Rājat.* i. 28-31. The Nāgas are supposed to have come to Kaśmīr when Kaśyapa, their father, had drained 'the lake of Satī,' and to have found there a refuge from Garuda; comp. *Nīlamata*, 59 sqq.

² Compare the legends of the *Sodara* spring, i. 123 sqq.; of the *Kṛtyāśrama* Vihāra, i. 131 sqq.; of the *Jyeṣṭharudra* at *Nandikṣetra* and *Srīnagarī*, i. 113, 124; the story of the *Suśravas* Nāga, i. 203 sqq.; the description of the pilgrimage to the *Takṣaka* Nāga, i. 220 sqq.; the story of the *Īśēśvara* temple, ii. 134; of *Raṇasvāmin*, iii. 439 sqq., etc.

³ See vii. 954; viii. 2365 and note v. 55 sqq. Compare also below, § 57.

⁴ See Note L, viii. 2492, § 4.

Kalhana from Padmamihira in which certain local names are by fanciful etymologies connected with seven of the 'lost kings,'¹ it may be safely assumed that these attributions are based either on historical fact or at least on genuine local tradition. Kalhana specially informs us in his introduction² that among the documents he had consulted for his work, there were 'the inscriptions recording the consecration of temples and grants [of land] by former kings.' Such records no doubt supplied a great portion of the numerous notices above referred to. Often such notices may have been taken from less authentic sources. But we may always claim for them the merit of acquainting us with the names of the respective localities and buildings, as used in the official language of Kalhana's time, and with the traditions then current regarding their origin and date.

The system of nomenclature which was regularly followed in Kaśmīr in naming new foundations, must have helped to preserve a genuine tradition regarding the founder. In the vast majority of cases the names of new towns and villages are formed by the addition of *-pura* to the name of the founder, either in its full or abbreviated form.³ Similarly the names of temples, monasteries, Maṭhas and other religious structures show the name of their builder followed by terms indicating the deity or the religious objects to which the building was dedicated.⁴ Many of

¹ See regarding this unhistorical list note i. 86. The local names, like *Khona-muṣa*, *Godharā*, *Sāmāṅgāsā*, etc., are all genuine enough. What Padmamihira did was to evolve fictitious names of kings out of these by means of popular etymology.

² i. 15.

³ Thus we have, e.g., the well-known localities of *Huṣkapura*, *Kaniṣkapura*, *Juṣkapura* (which retain the memory of their Indo-Scythian founders); *Pravara-pura* (for Pravarasenapura), the old official designation of the present capital; *Padmapura*, *Avantipura*, *Jayapura* (for Jayāpīḍapura) and a host of others. The custom of naming new localities in this fashion, or of renaming earlier ones in honour of the actual ruler, can be traced through successive periods of Muhammadan and Sikh rule down to the present day; comp. e.g., *Zaināpūr* (named after Zainu-l-'ābidīn); *Shahābuddīnpūr* (now *Shāḍīpūr*); *Muḥammadpūr*; *Raṅbīrsinghpūr* (intended to replace *Shāhābād*), etc.

⁴ Thus in the case of Siva-temples *-īśa* or *-īśvara* is invariably added (comp., e.g., *Pravareśvara*, *Amṛteśvara*, etc.), as in that of Viṣṇu-shrines with equal regularity *-svāmin* (*-keśava*); comp. e.g., *Muktasvāmin* (built by Muktāpīḍa), *Avantisvāmin*, *Bhīmakeśava* (erected by Bhīmapāla Sāhi), etc.

Buddhist monasteries receive the name of their founder with the addition of *-vihāra* or *-bhavana*; comp. *Jayendravihāra*, *Caṅkuṇavihāra*, *Amṛtabhavana* (founded by Queen Amṛtaprabhā, the present Āntābavan), *Skandabhavana* (for Skandaguptabhavana), and many more, as shown in my *Notes on Ou-k'ong*, p. 4.

For Maṭhas compare e.g. *Didāmaṭha* (*Didāmar*); *Subhaṭāmaṭha*, *Nandāmaṭha*, *Loṭhikāmaṭha*, *Cakramaṭha*, etc.

these religious structures left their names to the sites at which they were erected. They can thus be traced to the present day in the designations of villages or city quarters.¹

The topographical interest which Kalhana's notices of town-foundations possess is considerably enhanced by the fact that in more than one case they are accompanied by accurate descriptions of the site chosen and the buildings connected with them. Thus Kalhana's detailed accounts of the foundation of *Pravarapura*, iii. 336-363, is curiously instructive even in its legendary particulars. It enables us to trace with great precision the original position and limits of the city which was destined to remain thereafter the capital of Kaśmīr.² Similarly the description given of *Parihāsapura* and its great shrines has made it possible for me to fix with accuracy the site of the town which Lalitāditya's fancy elevated for a short time to the rank of a capital, and to identify the remains of the great buildings which once adorned it.³ Not less valuable from an antiquarian point of view is the account given to us of the twin towns *Jayapura* and *Dvāravatī* which King Jayāpīḍa founded as his royal residence near the marshes of Andarkōṭh.⁴ We shall see below to what extent the correct identification of the extant ruins of Kaśmīr has been facilitated by these and similar accounts of the Rājatarāṅgiṇī.

20. Valuable as the data are which we gather from the two groups of notices just discussed, it may yet be doubted whether by themselves, that is, unsupported by other information, they can throw as much light on the old topography of Kaśmīr as the notices which we have yet to consider. I mean the whole mass of incidental references to topographical points which we find interwoven with the historical narrative of the Chronicle.

It is evident that where localities are mentioned in the course of a connected relation of events, the context if studied with due regard to the facts of the actual topography, must help us towards a correct identification of the places meant. In the case of the previous notices the Chronicler has but rarely occasion to give us distinct indications as to the position of the sites or shrines he intended. In our

¹ The name of the *Amṛtabhavana*, iii. 9, survives in the present *Āntābavan*; *Didāmaṭha* and *Skandabhavana* in the *Didāmar* and *Khandābavan* quarters of *Srīnagar*; similarly Lalitāditya's great temple of *Māntāṇḍu* left its name to the village and district of *Maṭan*.

² See note iii. 339-349 and below, § 92.

³ Compare Note *F*, iv. 194-204, and below, § 121.

⁴ See note iv. 506-511; also below, § 122.

attempts to identify the latter we have therefore only too often to depend either on the accidental fact of other texts furnishing the required evidence, or to fall back solely on the comparison of the old with modern local names. That the latter course if not guided and controlled by other evidence, is likely to lead us into mistakes, is a fact which requires no demonstration for the critical student.

It is different with the notices the consideration of which we have left to the last. Here the narrative itself, in the great majority of cases, becomes our guide and either directly points out to us the real locality meant or at least restricts to very narrow limits the area within which our search must proceed. The final identification can then be safely effected with the help of local tradition, by tracing the modern derivative of the old local name, or by other additional evidence of this kind.

For the purpose of such a systematic search it is, of course, a very great advantage if the narrative is closely connected and detailed. And it is on this account that, as already stated above (§ 17), Kalhana's lengthy relation of what was to him recent history, in Books vii. and viii., is for us so valuable. An examination of the topographical notes in my commentary on the Chronicle will show that the correct identification of many of the localities mentioned in the detached notices of the first six Books has become possible only by means of the evidence furnished by the more detailed narrative of the last two.

In this respect the accounts of the endless rebellions and other internal troubles which fill the greater portion of the reigns of the Lohara dynasty, have proved particularly useful. The description of the many campaigns, frontier-expeditions and sieges connected with these risings supplies us with a great amount of topographical details mutually illustrating each other. By following up these operations on the map,—or better still on the actual ground, as I was often able to do,—it is possible to fix with precision the site of many old localities which would otherwise never have emerged from the haze of doubt and conjecture.

In order to illustrate these general remarks it will be sufficient to refer to a few typical examples among the many identifications thus arrived at. As the corresponding notes of my commentary fully indicate the evidence on which these identifications are based, as well as the process of reasoning by which they were arrived at, it will not be necessary here to go into details. A very characteristic example is furnished by the important stronghold and territory of LOHARA, which was formerly supposed to be Lahore. Its correct location at the present *Loharin* and the identification of the several places and routes

mentioned in the same neighbourhood became possible only, as Note *E*, iv. 177, shows,¹ through the indications contained in Kalhaṇa's description of the several sieges which this mountain fastness underwent in his own time. Similar instances are the identifications of the GOPĀDRI hill (the present Takht-i Sulaimān), and of the streams MAHĀSARIT and KṢIPTIKĀ (Mār and Kut^akul). Though prominent features in the topography of the capital itself, they could not have been correctly located but for the evidence supplied by the narrative of the last Book.² The same is the case, *e.g.*, with the name of the district HOLAPĀ (Vular) and the important ethnic designation of *Khaśa*.³

21. It is impossible to read attentively Kalhaṇa's Chronicle and in particular those portions which give fuller occasion for the notice of localities, without being struck with the exactness of his statements regarding the latter and with, what I

**Accuracy of
Kalhaṇa's
topography.**

may call, his eye for matters topographical.

We must appreciate these qualities all the more if we compare Kalhaṇa's local references with that vague and loose treatment which topographical points receive at the hands of Sanskrit authors generally.⁴ If it has been possible to trace with accuracy the great majority of localities mentioned in the Chronicle, this is largely due to the precision which Kalhaṇa displays in his topographical terminology. It is evident that he had taken care to acquaint himself with the localities which formed the scene of the events he described. Here too I may refer for more detailed evidence to my translation of the work and the notes which accompany it. A few characteristic points may, however, be specified as examples.

Striking evidence for the care with which Kalhaṇa indicates topo-

¹ Compare also my paper on the 'Castle of Lohara,' *Ind. Ant.* 1897, p. 225 *sqq.* below, § 49.

² Compare for *Gopādri*, notes i. 341; viii. 1104-10; for the *Mahāsarit*, note iii. 339-349; for the *Kṣiptikā*, note viii. 732.

³ See notes i. 306 and i. 317.

⁴ Nor should we forget the difficulty which Kalhaṇa had to face by writing in metrical form. True indeed it is what Albērūnī says of this form as adopted by Hindu scientific writers: "Now it is well-known that in all metrical compositions there is much misty and constrained phraseology merely intended to fill up the metre and serving as a kind of patchwork, and this necessitates a certain kind of verbosity. This is also one of the reasons why a word has sometimes one meaning and sometimes another" (*India*, i. p. 19).

Fortunately Kalhaṇa has managed to escape these dangers as far as the topographical notices of his work are concerned. We find in his local terminology neither that mistiness nor multiplicity of meaning Albērūnī so justly complains of.

graphical details, is furnished by his description of the great operations which were carried out under Avantivarman with a view to regulating the course of the Vitastā and draining the Valley.¹ Thanks to the exactness with which the relative position of the old and new confluence of the Vitastā and Sindhu is described, before and after the regulation, respectively, it has been possible even after so many centuries to trace in detail the objects and results of an important change in the hydrography of the Valley.²

Equal attention to the topographical details we find in numerous accounts of military operations. Of these it will suffice to quote here the descriptions of the several sieges of Śrīnagar, under Sussala;³ the battle on the *Gopādrī* hill in the same reign;⁴ the blockade of *Lohara*, with the disastrous retreat through the mountains that followed,⁵ and, last but not least, the siege of the *Siraḥśilā* castle. The topographical accuracy of the latter account as proved in Note *L*, viii. 2492, almost presupposes on Kalhaṇa's part a personal examination of the site. It is all the more noteworthy, because the scene of the events there recorded was a region outside Kaśmīr proper, distant and difficult of access.

There are also smaller points that help to raise our estimate of Kalhaṇa's reliability in topographical matters. Of such I may mention for example the close agreement we can trace everywhere between Kalhaṇa's statements regarding distances, whether given in road or time-measure, and the actual facts. The number of marches reckoned by him is thus always easily verified by a reference to the stages observed on the corresponding modern routes.⁶ Not less gratifying is it to find how careful Kalhaṇa is to distinguish between homonymous localities.⁷ In addition we must give credit to our author for the just observation of many characteristic features in the climate, ethnography, and economical condition of Kaśmīr and the neighbouring regions.⁸ All these notices help to invest with additional interest the data furnished for the old topography of the country.

¹ Compare v. 84-121.

² Compare Note *I*, v. 97-100, on the *Vitastāsindhusaṅgama*, and below, §§ 69-72.

³ See viii. 729 *sqq*; 1060 *sqq*.

⁴ Compare viii. 1099-1115.

⁵ See viii. 1842-80 and Note *E*, iv. 177, § 10.

⁶ Compare for distance measurements note i. 264; v. 103; vii. 393; for the reckoning of marches on the Vitastā Valley route, v. 225; on the Tōṣāmaidān pass, vii. 140; on the route to the Pīr Panṭsāl Pass, vii. 558; on the way to Mārtāṇḍa, vii. 715, etc.

⁷ Compare notes i. 113; i. 124; v. 123 on the several *Jyeṣṭharudras* and the way in which Kalhaṇa specifies them.

⁸ Compare below, §§ 77-79.

If the advantages thus accorded to us are duly weighed there seems every reason to congratulate ourselves on the fact that the earliest and fullest record of Kaśmīr history that has come down to us was written by a scholar of Kalhaṇa's type. Whatever the shortcomings of his work from a historical point of view may be, we may well claim for him the merit that he has provided us with a sound and ample basis for the study of the historical geography of his country.

22. Another point still remains to be considered here in connection with Kalhaṇa's Chronicle, *viz.*, to what extent can we accept the Sanskrit forms found in his text as the genuine local names of the period.

Sanskrit form of
local names.

This question deserves attention, because the popular language actually spoken in Kaśmīr in Kalhaṇa's time and for many centuries earlier, was not Sanskrit but undoubtedly an Apabhraṃśa dialect derived from it, which has gradually developed into the modern Kaśmīrī.

Notwithstanding this circumstance I think that Kalhaṇa's local names can on the whole safely be taken as the genuine designations of the localities, *i.e.*, those originally given to them. My grounds for this belief are the following.

We have ample evidence to show that Sanskrit was the official and sole literary language of the country, not only in Kalhaṇa's own time but also in those earlier periods from which the records used by him may have dated. This official use of Sanskrit we know to have continued in Kaśmīr even into Muhammadan times. It assures us at once that the vast majority of village and town names must from the beginning have been given in Sanskrit. A detailed examination of Kalhaṇa's local names will easily demonstrate, on the one hand that these names are of genuinely Sanskrit formation, and on the other, that their modern Kaśmīrī representatives are derived from them by a regular process of phonetic conversion. We look in vain among this class of old local names for any which would show a foreign, *i.e.*, non-Aryan origin and might be suspected of having only subsequently been pressed into a Sanskrit garb.

As Sanskrit was used as the language of all official records for many centuries previous to Kalhaṇa's time, the Sanskrit names originally intended for the great mass of inhabited places could be preserved, in official documents anyhow, without any difficulty or break of tradition. And from such documents most of Kalhaṇa's notices of places were undoubtedly derived, directly or indirectly.

Only in rare cases can we suppose that the original form of a local name of this kind had been lost sight of, and that accordingly the Chronicler, or his authority, had to fall back on the expedient of sanskriti-

zing in its stead the Apabhraṃśa or Kaśmīrī form, as well as he could. There are in fact a few instances in which we have indications of such a metamorphosis. Thus we find the same local name spelt either *Bhaleraka* or *Baleraka* in the Chronicle, and a village which Kalhaṇa calls *Ghoramūlaka*, referred to by Abhinanda, the author of the *Kādambarīkathāsāra* (first half of 9th century), as *Gauramūlaka*.¹ It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that we have here varying attempts to reproduce in a Sanskrit garb original Apabhraṃśa names. But these cases are very rare indeed, and even in them other explanations of the different spellings are possible.

These observations apply with nearly the same force also to other local names recorded in the Chronicle, such as those of mountains, streams, passes, etc. The great majority of these names must have very early found their place in official documents or, as we shall see below, in the Sanskrit legendaries or *Māhātmyas* of the numerous Tirthas. If any of them are in reality adaptations of Prakrit or Apabhraṃśa forms, their quasi-official use is yet likely to have originated a long time before the date of Kalhaṇa.

Even to the present day the local nomenclature of Kaśmīr, whether in the Valley or in the mountains, shows throughout an unmistakeably Sanskrit character. This is most clearly illustrated by the constant recurrence of such terms as *-pūr* or *pōr* (< *pura*), *-mar* (< *maṭha*), *-hōm* (< *āśrama*), *-kōṭh* (< *koṭṭa*), *-gām* or *gōm* (< *grāma*), *-kuṇḍal* (< *kuṇḍala*), *-vōr* (< *vāṭa*), in village names; of *-sar* (< *saras*), *-nambal* (< *naḍvalā*), *nāg* (< *nāga*) in names of lakes, marshes, etc.; of *-van* (< *vana*), *-nār*, (< *nāḍa*), *-marg* (< *maṭhikā*), *-gul* (< *galikā*), *brāṛ* (< *bhaṭṭārikā*), *-vath* (< *patha*) in designations of alpine localities, peaks, passes, etc.; *-kul* (< *kulyā*), *-khan* (< *khani*) in names of streams and canals.

The Sanskrit etymology of the specific names preceding these terms, is even in their modern phonetic form very often equally transparent. At an earlier stage of the language the Apabhraṃśa names must have approached the corresponding Sanskrit forms much more closely. The reproduction of the popular names in a Sanskrit form could have then but rarely been attended with much difficulty or doubt. We may hence safely assume that the Sanskrit forms recorded by Kalhaṇa represent in most cases correctly the original local names, and in the remainder cannot differ much from them.

23. The later Sanskrit Chronicles which were composed with the distinct object of continuing Kalhaṇa's work, furnish valuable supplements to the topographical information contained in the latter.

**Later Sanskrit
Chronicles.**

¹ Compare notes viii. 1861, and vii. 1239; viii. 2410.

These Chronicles are the *Rājatarāṅgiṇī* of Jonarāja who continued the narrative down to the reign of Sultān Zainu-l-'ābidin and died over his work, A.D. 1459;¹ the *Jaina-Rājatarāṅgiṇī* composed by Jonarāja's pupil Śrīvara which deals in four Books with the period A.D. 1459-86;² and finally, the Fourth Chronicle which was begun under the name *Rājāvalipatākā* by Prājyabhaṭṭa and completed by his pupil Suka some years after the annexation of Kaśmīr by Akbar, A.D. 1586.³

It will be seen from the above dates that the narrative of the last two works falls entirely beyond the period of Hindu rule to which our enquiry is limited, and which may be considered to close finally with the usurpation of Shāh Mīr, A.D. 1339. The same holds good of the greater portion of Jonarāja's Chronicle. The reigns of the late Hindu rulers, from Jayasimha to Queen Koṭā, are there disposed of with a brevity corresponding more to their own insignificance than to the intrinsic historical interest of the epoch.⁴ Notwithstanding this difference in date the materials supplied by these later Chronicles have often proved of great use in clearing up points of the old topography of Kaśmīr. For the mass of localities mentioned in them goes back to the Hindu period, and the names by which they are referred to, are also still mostly the old ones.

Yet on the whole the inferiority of these later Chronicles when compared with Kalhaṇa's work, is as marked in the matter of topographical information as it is in other respects. In the first place it must be noted that the whole text of these three distinct works does not amount to more than about one-half of Kalhaṇa's work. For references to sacred sites and buildings and other places of religious interest the account of Muhammadan reigns offers naturally but little opportunity. The incidental notices of other localities are also in proportion less numerous and instructive. For these later authors allow considerably more room to episodic descriptions and do by no means show that care for accuracy in topographical statements which we have noticed in Kalhaṇa.

It is curious to note how the gradual decline of Hindu learning in Kaśmīr during the period of troubles and oppression which lasted with short interruptions for two and a half centuries previous to Akbar's conquest, is marked also in the character and contents of these later

¹ See *Śrīv.* i. 6.

² See Fourth Chron. 6.

³ Compare Fourth Chron. 8 *sqq.* Prājyabhaṭṭa's composition ended with the year A.D. 1513-14 and the reign of Fataḥ Shāh (verses 14-64).

⁴ The narrative of the period 1149-1339 A.D. fills only 305 verses in Jonarāja's Chronicle (347 according to the Bombay edition).

Chronicles. JONARĀJA was a scholar of considerable attainments, but apparently without any originality. He shows himself yet well-acquainted with the old local nomenclature of the Valley, though outside it he too commits himself to forms like *Puruṣavīra* (for Peshawar, recte *Puruṣapura*), etc.

ŚRĪVARA is a slavish imitator of Kalhaṇa, not above reproducing whole verses of his predecessor. His text looks often more like a *cento* from the *Rājatarāṅgiṇī* than an original composition. Notwithstanding the thorough study of Kalhaṇa's work which this kind of exploitation presupposes, we find Śrīvara more than once betraying ignorance of the old names for well-known Kaśmīr localities. Thus we have the name of the *Mahāsarit* stream transformed into *Mārī*, an evident adaptation of the modern *Mār*;¹ *Siddhapatha*, the modern *Sidau*, represented as *Siddhādeśa*;² the Tirtha of *Mārtāṇḍa* regularly referred to by its modern name *Bhavana* (*Bavan*), etc.³

The work of PRĀJYABHAṬṬA and ŚUKA is inferior in composition even to Śrīvara's Chronicle, and by the increased number of modern local names proves its authors' scant familiarity with the old topography of Kaśmīr. Thus the ancient *Kṛtyāśrama*, the scene of Kalhaṇa's Buddhist legend, i. 131 *sqq.*, figures repeatedly in their narrative as *Kīcāśrama*, *i.e.*, by its modern name *Kiṭs^ahōm*.⁴ Even the well-known *Rājapurī* is metamorphosed into *Rājavīra* (!), a queer reproduction of the modern *Rajaurī*.⁵ The old castle of *Lohara* reappears as *Luhara*, an evident approach to the present *Lōh^arin*;⁶ the ancient site of *Cakra-dhara* is turned into *Cakrādhāra*, etc.⁷

It is evident that when Sanskrit ceased to be the language used for official purposes, the knowledge of the ancient names of localities and of the traditions connected with the latter must have become gradually more and more restricted. In view of this decrease of traditional knowledge we have to exercise some caution when utilizing the evidence of the later historical texts for the elucidation of the old topographical data. At the same time it is easy to realize that their help is often of considerable value when connecting links have to be traced between those earlier data and the facts of modern topography.

¹ See *Śrīv.* i. 440; iii. 278; comp. note on *Rājat.* iii. 339.

² *Śrīv.* iii. 354; iv. 203, 661.

³ *Śrīv.* i. 376; iii. 372.

⁴ See Fourth Chron. 234, 240, 384; compare also note on *Rājat.* i. 147.

⁵ Fourth Chron. 542, *sqq.*

⁶ *Ib.*, 134, 143, *sqq.*

⁷ *Ib.*, 330.

24. It is convenient to refer here briefly to the Persian *Tārīkh* of Kaśmīr which to some extent may be looked upon as continuing the works of Kalhaṇa and his Paṇḍit successors. Unfortunately they furnish no material assistance for the study of the old topography of the country.

All these works give in their initial portion an account of the Hindu dynasties which pretends to be translated from the *Rājatarāṅgīnī*. Yet the abstract so given is in each case very brief and chiefly devoted to a reproduction of the legendary and anecdotal parts of Kalhaṇa's narrative. We thus look in vain in these abstracts for the modern equivalents of those local names, the identification of which is attended with any difficulty.

In illustration of this it may be mentioned that even the *Tārīkh* of Ḥaidar Malik Cādura (*Tsād^{ur}*),¹ which is the earliest work of this class accessible to me and the fullest in its account of the Hindu period, compresses the narrative of Jayasīma's reign, filling about two thousand verses in the *Rājatarāṅgīnī*, into two quarto pages. Of the localities mentioned in the original account of this reign not a single one is indicated by the Muhammadan Chronicler.

The later works which all belong to the 18th or the present century, are still more reticent on the Hindu period and seem to have largely copied Ḥaidar Malik's abstract. Taking into account the endless corruptions to which local names written in Persian characters are exposed, it will be readily understood why reference to these texts on points of topographical interest yields only in the rarest cases some tangible result.

25. It is a fortunate circumstance that several of the older Kaśmīr poets whose works have been preserved for us, have had the good sense to let us know something about their own persons and homes. The topographical details which can be gleaned from these authors, though comparatively few in number, are yet of distinct value. They enable us to check by independent evidence Kalhaṇa's local nomenclature, and in some instances acquaint us with localities of which we find no notice in the *Chronicles*.

The first and most helpful of these Kaśmīrian authors is the well-known polyhistor KṢEMENDRA. His works, composed in the second and third quarter of the 11th century, form important landmarks in various fields of Indian literature. Kṣemendra seems to have felt a genuine

¹ Written A.H. 1027, *i.e.*, A.D. 1617, in the twelfth year of Jahāngīr's reign. Ḥaidar Malik takes his epithet *Cādura*, recte *Tsād^{ur}*, from the Kaśmīr village of that name situated in the Nāgām Pargaṇa, some 10 miles south of Śrīnagar, close to the village of Vahṛtōr.

interest, rare enough among Indian scholars, for the realities of his country and the life around him. He does not content himself with informing us of his family, the date of his works and the places where he wrote them.¹

In the *Samayamātrkā*, one of his most original poems, which is intended to describe the snares of courtezans, he gives among other stories an amusing account of the wanderings of his chief heroine, Kaṅkāli, through the length and breadth of Kāsmīr.² The numerous places which form the scene of her exploits, can all easily enough be traced on the map. More than once curious touches of true local colour impart additional interest to these references. To Kṣemendra's poem we owe, e.g., the earliest mention of the Pir Panṭsāl Pass (*Pañcāladhārā*) and its hospice (*maṭha*).³ There too we get a glimpse of the ancient salt trade which still follows that route with preference. Elsewhere we see the heroine smuggling herself as a Buddhist nun into the ancient Vihāra of *Kṛtyāśrama*, etc.⁴

A different sketch of topographical interest we owe to the poet BILHAṆA. He left his native land early in the reign of King Kalaśa (1063-89 A.D.), and after long wanderings became famous as the court poet of the Cālukya king Tribhuvanamalla Parmāḍi in the Dekhan. In the last canto of his historical poem, the *Vikramāṅkadevacarita*, Bilhaṇa gives us a glowing picture of the beauties of the Kāsmīr capital. Notwithstanding its panegyric character, this account is laudably exact in its local details.⁵ In another passage the poet describes to us his rural home and its surroundings at the village of *Khonamuṣa*, south-east of Śrīnagar. His touching verses attest as much his yearning for his distant home as the faithfulness of his local recollections.⁶

¹ Compare the colophons of the various works first discovered and noticed by Prof. BÜHLER, *Report*, pp. 45 sqq. and Appendix.

² This humorous peregrination fills the ii. Samaya of the work; see *Kāvya-mālā* edition, pp. 6-16. The abundance of curious local details makes a commentated translation of the little Kāvya very desirable, notwithstanding the risky nature of part of its contents. A personal knowledge of Kāsmīr would certainly be required for the task.

³ See *Samayam*. ii. 90 sqq. The *maṭha* on the pass corresponds to the present 'Alīābād Sarai, a short distance below the top of the pass on the Kāsmīr side; see below, § 44.

⁴ *Samayam*. ii. 61 sqq.

⁵ Prof. BÜHLER to whom we owe the discovery of Bilhaṇa's chief work, has given in his Introduction an admirable analysis of the contents of Sarga xviii. as illustrating the poet's biography. For his description of contemporary Śrīnagara, see pp. 7 sqq.

⁶ See *Vikram*. xviii. 70 sqq. Prof. Bühler during his Kāsmīr tour, 1875, had the satisfaction of visiting the poet's native place, the present village of *Khunṣmoh*.

Similar in character though less ample in detail, is the description of Kāsmīr and its capital Pravarapura which Maṅkha, Kalhaṇa's contemporary, inserts in the iii. Canto of his *Kāvya Śrīkaṇṭhacarita*.¹ Here we have the advantages of a commentary written by Jonarāja, the Chronicler, which duly notices and explains the points of local interest.

26. To complete our review of those Kāsmīrian texts of topographical interest which may be distinguished as secular, we must refer briefly to the curious glossary and manual which goes by the name of *Kṣemendra's Lokaprakāśa*. Professor A. Weber has recently published valuable extracts from this text.² I myself have had occasion to refer to it frequently in the notes on the *Rājataranṅinī*.³ The work represents a strange mixture of the usual Kośa and a practical handbook dealing with various topics of administration and private life in Kāsmīr.

A great deal of the information contained in it is decidedly old, and probably from the hand of our well-known Kṣemendra. But there are unmistakable proofs, both in the form and contents of the book, showing that it has undergone considerable alterations and additions down even to the 17th century. This is exactly what we must expect in a work which had remained in the practical use of the Kāsmīrian 'Kārkuṅs' long after the time when Sanskrit had ceased to be the official language of the country.

The *Lokaprakāśa* supplies us with the earliest list of Kāsmīr Pargaṇas. It gives besides the names of numerous localities inserted in the forms for bonds, 'Huṇḍis,' contracts, official reports, and the like which form the bulk of *Prakāśas* ii. and iv. The Pargaṇa list as well as these forms exhibit local names of undoubtedly ancient date side by side with comparatively modern ones. Some of the latter belong to places which were only founded during the Muhammadan rule.⁴

He could thus verify on the spot every point of the description which Bilhaṇa gives of that "coquettish embellishment of the bosom of Mount Himālaya;" see *Report*, pp. 4 sqq.

¹ See *Śrīkaṇṭhac.* iii. 10-24, 68 sqq.

² See *Zu Kṣemendra's Lokaprakāśa*, in *Indische Studien*, xviii. pp. 289-412.

³ See particularly Note H (iv. 495), on the Kāsmīr monetary system, § 10.

⁴ Compare, e.g., in *Prakāśa* ii. *Jainanagara*, founded by Zainu-l-'ābīdīn (see *Jonar.* 1153); *Alābhadenapura* (*Śrīv.* iv. 318), etc.

SECTION VI.—THE NĪLAMATA AND MĀHĀTMYAS.

27. We have already above drawn attention to the fact that Kaśmīr has since early times been pre-eminently a country of holy sites and places of pilgrimage of all kinds. These objects of ancient local worship have always played an important part in the historical topography of the Valley and the adjacent mountain regions. It is hence no small advantage that there are abundant materials at our disposal for the special study of this *Topographia sacra* of Kaśmīr.

**The Nīlamata-
purāṇa.**

The oldest extant text which deals in detail with Kaśmīrian Tirthas, is the *Nīlamatapurāṇa*. This work which Kalhaṇa used as one of his sources,¹ claims to give the sacred legends regarding the origin of the country and the special ordinances which Nīla, the lord of Kaśmīr Nāgas, had revealed for the worship and rites to be observed in it.²

It is unnecessary to refer here to the legends which are related at the commencement of work, and to 'the rites proclaimed by Nīla' which together with the former occupy about two-thirds of the extant text.³ These parts have been fully discussed by Prof. Bühler in his lucid analysis of the Nīlamata.⁴ The remaining portions, however, deserve here special notice as forming,—to use Prof. Bühler's words—"a real mine of information, regarding the sacred places of Kaśmīr and their legends."

In the first place we find there a list of the principal Nāgas or sacred springs of Kaśmīr (vv. 900-975). This is followed by the interesting legend regarding the Mahāpadma lake, the present Volur, which is supposed to occupy the place of the submerged city of *Candrapura* (vv. 976-1008).⁵ The Purāṇa then proceeds to an enumeration of miscellaneous Tirthas chiefly connected with Śiva's worship (vv. 1009-48). To this is attached a very detailed account, designated as *Bhūteśvaramāhātmya*, of the legends connected with the sacred lakes and sites on Mount Haramukuṭa (vv. 1049-1148).⁶ Of a similar Māhātmya relating to the Kapaṭeśvara Tirtha, the present Kōṭhēr,⁷ only a fragment is found in our extant text (vv. 1149-68). The list of

¹ See *Rājat.* i. 14.

² Compare *Rājat.* i. 178-184.

³ *Nīlamata*, vv. 1-366, contain the legends, v. 367-899 the rites above referred to.

⁴ See *Report*, pp. 38 sqq.

⁵ Compare below, § 74, and *Report*, p. 10.

⁶ Compare below, § 57, and *Rājat.* notes i, 36, 107, 113.

⁷ See below, § 112, and *Rājat.* i. 32 note.

Viṣṇu-Tīrthas which succeeds it (vv. 1169-1248), is comparatively short, as indeed the position of this god is a secondary one in the popular worship of Kāśmīr.

After a miscellaneous list of sacred Saṅgamas or river-confluences, Nāgas and lakes (vv. 1249-78) we are treated to a somewhat more detailed synopsis of the chief Tīrthas of Kāśmīr (vv. 1271-1371). This is of special interest, because an attempt is made here to describe the Tīrthas in something like topographical order, and to group with them such localities as are visited on the same pilgrimage. It is thus possible to determine, with more certainty than in the case of other Tīrtha lists, the particular holy sites intended by the author.

This synopsis starts in the east with the fountain of the Nilanāga (Vērnāg), and follows with more or less accuracy the course of the Vitastā and its affluents down to the gorge of Varāhamūla. A short *Vitastāmāhātmya*, describing the origin and miraculous powers of this the holiest of Kāśmīr rivers (vv. 1371-1404), closes the text of Nilamata, such as it is found in our Manuscripts.

This text is unfortunately in a very bad condition owing to numerous lacunæ and textual corruptions of all kinds. Prof. Bühler held that the Nilamata in its present form could not be older than the 6th or 7th century of our era.¹ It appears to me by no means improbable that the text has undergone changes and possibly additions at later periods. On the whole, however, the local names found in it bear an ancient look and agree closely with the forms used by Kalhaṇa. The difference in this respect between the Nilamata and the Māhātmyas, in their extant recensions, is very marked and helps to prove the comparatively late date of most of the latter. On the other hand it deserves to be noted that without the more systematic and detailed accounts of the various Tīrthas as found in the Māhātmyas, the identification of many of the sacred places referred to in the Nilamata would probably have been impossible.

The fact of all extant copies of the work showing practically the same defective text, seems to indicate that the changes and additions to which I alluded above, cannot be quite recent. If such a revision had been made at a time comparatively near to the date of our oldest MS. we could, after the analogy of other instances, expect an outwardly far more correct, *i.e.* 'cooked,' text. The operation here suggested was actually performed some thirty years ago by the late Paṇḍit Sāhibrām. Receiving the orders of Mahārāja Raṅbir Singh to

¹ Compare *Report*, p. 40. The oldest and best MS. of the Nilamata which I was able to secure and collate, is dated in the Laukika year 81. This date judging from the appearance of the MS. probably corresponds to A.D. 1705-6.

prepare the text of the Nilamata for edition, he 'revised' the work with scant respect for its sacred character by filling up the lacunæ, expanding obscure passages, removing ungrammatical forms, etc.¹ Fortunately Prof. Bühler reached Kaśmīr early enough to learn the origin of this 'cooked' text, and to give due warning as to its true character.

The Nilamata seems thus to have escaped in recent times that process of continual adaptation which, as we shall see, must be assumed to have greatly affected all extant Māhātmyas. The reason probably is that it could never have been used, like the latter, as a practical pilgrims' manual and itinerary by the Purohitas of the various Tīrthas.

28. Among the texts dealing specially with the sacred sites of Kaśmīr the *Haracaritacintāmaṇi* can be placed, perhaps, nearest in date to the Nilamata-purāṇa. It is not like the latter and the

The Haracarita-
cintāmaṇi.

Māhātmyas, an anonymous composition, claiming recognition in the wide folds of canonical Purāṇa literature. It owns as its author the poet *Jayadratha*, of the Kaśmīrian family of the Rājānakas, and a brother of *Jayaratha*. The pedigree of the family as given in *Jayaratha's Tantrālokaviveka*, a Śaiva treatise, shows that *Jayadratha* must have lived about the end of the 12th or beginning of the 13th century.²

His work which is written in a simple Kāvya style, relates in thirty-two Cantos as many legends concerning Śiva and his various Avatāras.³ Eight of these legends are localized at well-known Kaśmīrian Tīrthas. They give the author ample opportunity of mentioning other sacred sites of Kaśmīr directly or indirectly connected with the former.⁴

Jayadratha's detailed exposition helps to fix clearly the form which the legends regarding some of the most popular of Kaśmīrian Tīrthas had assumed in the time immediately following *Kalhaṇa*. The local names as recorded by *Jayadratha*, agree closely with those of the *Rājatarāṅgiṇī*.⁵ They prove clearly that the forms employed by *Kalhaṇa* must have been those generally current in the Sanskrit usage of the period. For the interpretation of Nilamata's brief notices the Hara-

¹ See *Report*, pp. 33, 38.

² Compare BÜHLER, *Report*, pp. 61, 81, cliii.

³ The *Haracaritacintāmaṇi* has recently been printed as No. 61 of the *Kāvya-mālā* Series, Bombay, (1897), chiefly from the text as contained in my MS. No. 206.

⁴ The cantos containing these legends are i. *Jvālāliṅgāvatāra*, iv. *Nandirudrāvatāra*, vii. *Cakrapradāna*; x.-xiv. *Vijayeśvara-*, *Piṅgaleśvara-*, *Vitastā-*, *Svayambhūnātha-*, *Kapaṭeśvara Avatāras*.

⁵ An index of the Kaśmīr local names in the *Haracaritacintāmaṇi*, with explanatory notes, has been prepared under my supervision by P. Govind Kaul and printed as an Appendix to the *Kāvya-mālā* edition.

caritacintāmaṇi is of great value. Its plain and authentic narrative enables us often to trace the numerous modifications which the various local legends as well as the names of the localities connected with them have undergone in the extant Māhātmyas.

29. Reference has already been made above to the numerous texts known as *Māhātmyas* which we possess of all the more important Tīrthas of Kāśmīr. **The Māhātmyas.** They claim with few exceptions to be extracted from Purāṇas or Purāṇic collections (*Samhitās*).¹ Ordinarily they set forth in detail the legends relating to the particular pilgrimage place, the spiritual and other benefits to be derived from its visit, and the special rites to be gone through by the pilgrims at the various stages of the itinerary. The abstract given of the Śāradāmāhātmya in Note B, on Rājat. i. 37, may serve to indicate the manner in which these subjects are usually treated in the average texts of this class.

Prof. Bühler was the first to recognize the value of the Māhātmyas for a systematic study of the old topography of Kāśmīr. Among the Sanskrit Manuscripts which he acquired during his tour in Kāśmīr, there are sixteen distinct texts of this kind.² My own search in this direction, facilitated by successive visits to the various Tīrthas themselves, has enabled me to collect altogether fifty-one separate Māhātmya texts. The list of my collection which has been given in a supplementary Note,³ may be considered fairly to exhaust the present range of this literature.

In extent the Māhātmyas vary greatly. By the side of texts like the *Vitastāmāhātmya* with its fifteen hundred Ślokas, we have legendaries of more modest dimensions amounting only to a few dozens of verses. Equally marked differences in the matter of age become apparent on closer examination.

Unmistakeable indications prove that many of the Māhātmyas now in actual use are of late composition or redaction. Among the texts so characterized, the Māhātmyas of some of the most popular pilgrimage places, like the Haramukuṭa lakes, the cave of Amaranātha, Īśeśvara (Īś̄b̄ar), are particularly conspicuous. The indications here referred to are furnished chiefly by the local names which in their very form often betray a modern origin. This may conveniently be illustrated by a

¹ Most of the Kāśmīr Māhātmyas allege to be portions of the *Bhṛṅgīśasamhitā*. Others claim special authority by representing themselves as parts of the Ādi, Brahma, Brahmavaivarta, Varāha and Bhaviṣyat Purāṇas.

² See *Report*, pp. iv. sqq. Nos. 48, 51, 52, 55, 62, 75, 82, 84, 99, 100 there quoted as separate texts are only chapters of the *Amaranāthamāhātmya*.

³ See Supplementary Note AA.

brief analysis of the most instructive of such names found in the *Vitastāmāhātmya*.

This text claims to furnish an account of all the Tirthas along the course of the holy river and is designated as a portion of the *Bhṛṅgiśa-samhitā*. Notwithstanding this pretended antiquity we find the famous Nilanāga introduced to us by the name of *Viranāga* (i. 58; ii. 33). This form is wholly unknown to the Nilamata, Rājatarāṅgiṇī or any old text. It is nothing but a clumsy rendering of the modern name of the village *Vērnāg* near which this fine spring is situated.¹ The ancient site of *Jayavana*, mentioned by Bilhaṇa and Kalhaṇa, the present *Zevan*, is metamorphosed into *Yavanī* (vi. 4).² The village of Pāndrēṭhan which derives its name from *Purāṇādhiṣṭhāna*,³ 'the old capital,' and bears the latter designation even in S'rīvara's Chronicle, figures as *Pādadr̥ṣṭika* (!), xii. 24. That *Mākṣikasvāmin* (Māy²sum)⁴ and the *Mahāsarit* (Mār)⁵ appear as *Māyāsīmā* and *Mārī*, can after this specimen of fancy nomenclature scarcely surprise us.

But we must all the same feel somewhat startled when we find that this text which claims to be revealed by S'iva, refers repeatedly to the modern village of *Shādīpūr*, at the confluence of the Vitastā and Sind, by the name of *Sāradāpura*. *Shādīpūr*, an abbreviation for *Shahābuddīn-pūr*, was, as Jonarāja's Chronicle shows, founded only in the 14th century by Sultān *Shahābu-d-dīn*.⁶ Quite on a level with the knowledge of old topography here displayed are many other references to localities, e.g., the mention of the modern garden *Shālimār*, a creation of the Mughals (Sālamāra), xxi. 39; of the ancient *Huṣkapura* as *Uṣah-karaṇa*⁷ (for Uṣkūr!), xxix. 103, etc.

In several cases these fancy renderings of modern local names are explained by whimsical etymologies which again in due turn give rise to new-fangled legends quite in the style of the old *nidānakathās*.

Similar proofs of modern origin can be traced in several other popular Māhātmyas, though perhaps not with equal frequency. Thus we find in the *Haramukutaṅgāmāhātmya* the name of the sacred mountain itself transformed from *Haramukuta* into *Haramukha* (the

¹ The name *Vērnāg* is probably derived from the name of the Pargaṇa *Vēr*, mentioned by Abū-l-Faẓl, ii. p. 370.

² See below, § 105.

³ See *Rājat.* iii. 99 note and below, § 89; also *S'rīv.* iv. 290.

⁴ See *Rājat.* iv. 88 note and below, § 99.

⁵ Compare *Rājat.* iii. 339-349 note and below, § 65.

⁶ See *Jonar.* 409. A popular etymology accepted in good faith by more than one European writer, sees in *Shādīpūr* the 'village of the marriage,' scil. between the Vitastā and Sind Rivers!

⁷ Compare *Rājat.* i. 168 note and below, § 124.

present Haramukh),¹ the ancient site of *Bhūteśvara* (Buthⁱśēr) so well-known to the Rājatarāṅgiṇī and all old texts, turned into *Bodheśvara*, etc. In the *Amaranāthamāhātmya* of which there is a comparatively old copy in the Poona collection, we are also treated to *Paḍṛṣṭi* as the Sanskrit name of Pāndrēṭhan, to *Suśramanāga* (for Kś. *Suśramnāg*) as the name of the lake where the Nāga *Suśravas* of the old legend took up his abode,² and the like. Examples of local names similarly perverted in other Māhātmyas will have to be mentioned *passim* in our account below.

It is important to note that by the side of texts like those just mentioned, there are others which on the whole show close conformity with our genuine old sources both in matter of legend and local names.³ And even in the Māhātmyas which in their present form we have every reason to consider as recent compositions, there is often abundant evidence of the use of earlier materials and traditions.⁴ It will be easier to understand the singular discrepancies in the value and character of these texts on examining the peculiar conditions under which they have originated.

30. The Māhātmyas are in the first place hand-books for the Purohitas of the particular Tirthas who have the privilege of taking charge of the pilgrims. They serve the priests as chief authorities for the claims they put forth on behalf of the holiness of their Tirtha, and for the rewards they promise for its visit. They are also intended to support their directions as to the rites to be observed by the pilgrim, and the route to be taken by him on the journey. It is usual for the Purohitas to recite the Māhātmya for the benefit of their clients in the course of the pilgrimage tour. At the same time its contents are expounded to them by a free verbal rendering in Kaśmīrī.

**Origin and purpose
of Māhātmyas.**

¹ See below, § 57. The kh at the end of the modern name is due to a phonetic law of Kaśmīrī which requires the aspiration of every final tenuis; see *J. A. S. B.*, 1897, p. 183.

² Compare *Rājat.* i. 267 note. The modern Kś. form *Suśramnāg* is the regular phonetic derivative of *Suśravanāga* by which name the lake is designated in the *Nīlamata*, *Haracaritacintāmaṇi*, etc.

³ Among such the Māhātmya collection known as the *Śarvāvatāra* (No. 213 in my list of MSS.), the *Mārtāṇḍamāhātmya* (No. 219), the *Vijayeśvaramāhātmya* (No. 220), may be particularly mentioned. None of these, however, are now known to the local Purohitas, more recent and inferior texts having taken their place.

⁴ Thus *e.g.*, the Māhātmya of the present *Iśābar* (*Īśeśvara*; see *Rājat.* ii. 134) shows plainly its very recent origin by calling the Tirtha *Īśavihāra* (a garbled reproduction of *Iśābrōr* < *Īśeśvara*), and by similar blunders. Yet it knows correctly the sacred spring of *Śatadhārā* already mentioned by Kṣemendra.

As but very few of the priests have enough knowledge of Sanskrit to follow the text intelligently, these translations are more or less learned by heart. Often as my manuscripts show, interlinear Kaśmīrī glosses are resorted to in order to assist the reader's memory.

These local priests known now in Kaśmīr as *thān^apatī* (Skr. *sthānapati*), are as a rule quite as ignorant and grasping as their confrères, the Pujārīs, Bhōjkīs, etc., of India proper. They are held deservedly in very low estimation by the rest of the Brahman community. That their condition was more or less the same in earlier times too, though their influence and numbers may have been greater, can be safely concluded from more than one ironical allusion of Kalhana.¹ These are the people to whose keeping the Māhātmya texts have always been entrusted. Their peculiar position and calling explain, I think, most of the curious changes which the latter have undergone.

Tenacious as local worship is, there is the evidence of concrete cases to show that not only the route of pilgrimage, but the very site of a Tirtha has sometimes been changed in comparatively recent times. In proof of this it will suffice to refer to the detailed account I have given of the transfers that have taken place in the case of the ancient Tirthas of *Bhedā* and *Sāradā*.² Minor modifications must naturally have been yet far more frequent. The visit of a principal Tirtha is regularly coupled with bathings, S'rāddhas and other sacrificial functions at a series of other sacred spots. The choice of these subsidiary places of worship must from the beginning have depended on local considerations. As these changed in the course of time, variations in the pilgrimage route must have unavoidably followed.

To bring the text of the Māhātmya into accord with these successive changes was a task which devolved upon the local Purohitas. The texts we have discussed above bear, in fact, only too manifestly the traces of their handiwork. Sound knowledge of Sanskrit and literary culture are likely to have been always as foreign to this class of men as they are at present. When it became necessary for them to introduce the names of new localities into the text of the Māhātmya there was every risk of these names being shown not in their genuine old forms, but in hybrid adaptations of their modern Kaśmīrī equivalents. This risk naturally increased when Sanskrit ceased to be the official language of Kaśmīr, and the knowledge of the old local names was gradually lost even among those maintaining scholarly traditions in the country.

¹ Compare *Rājat.* ii. 132 note and v. 465 *sqq.*; vii. 13 *sqq.*; viii. 709, 900 *sqq.*, 939.

² Compare Notes A (*Rājat.* i. 35) and B (*Rājat.* i. 37).

31. Another potent cause seems to have co-operated in this vitiation of the local nomenclature of the Māhātmyas.

Popular etymology
in local names of
Māhātmyas.

I mean 'popular etymology.' We have already referred to the tendency displayed throughout these tracts of making the names of localities,

rivers, springs, etc., the starting-point for legendary anecdotes. For men of such very scant knowledge of Sanskrit as the *thānapatī*s invariably are, it was naturally far easier to explain such etymological stories when they were based on the modern local names.

It is undoubtedly this reason which has, *e.g.*, led the compiler of the present Haramukūṭagaṅgāmāhātmya to substitute the name *Karaṅkanadī* for the old *Kanakavāhinī*. By the latter name the stream coming from the Haramukūṭa lakes is designated in all our old texts, as explained in my note on Rājat. i. 149-150. By turning *Kāṅk^anai*, the modern derivative of this old name, into *Karaṅkanadī*, 'the skeleton-stream,' the compiler of the Māhātmya gets an occasion to treat his readers to a legend likely to appeal to their imagination. The river is supposed to have received this appellation, because Garuḍa had dropped at its Saṅgama with the Sindhu the skeleton (*karaṅka*) of the Ṛṣi Dadhīci which Indra before had used as his weapon, etc.¹ This story, it is true, is wholly unknown to the Nīlamata or any other old text. But, on the other hand, it has got the great merit of being easily explained and proved to any Kaśmīrī pilgrim. He cannot fail to realize the manifest connection between *Karaṅka* and his familiar *k^aranz*, 'skeleton.'

An exactly similar case of 'popular etymology' has been noticed in the analysis of the Sāradāmāhātmya as contained in my Note B (i. 37). There the name of the village *Sun^a-Drang* is reproduced as *Suvarṇārdhāṅgaka* and explained by a legend, how the Muni Sāṅḍilya had at that spot half his body (*ardhāṅgaka*) turned into gold (*suvarṇa*), etc. In reality the village name is derived from the old term *Draṅga*, 'watch-station,' by which the place is mentioned by Kalhaṇa.² The distinguishing prefix *Sun^a-*, meaning 'gold' in Kaśmīrī, was given to it, because it lay on the route to the old gold-washing settlements in the Kiṣaṅgā Valley.³

¹ The story is spun out at great length in Paṭala iii. of the *Haramukūṭagaṅgāmāhātmya*, MS. No. 221.

² See viii. 2507, 2702.

³ For other examples of local names in Māhātmyas metamorphosed for the above reason, compare my notes Rājat. vi. 177 (*Bhīmadvīpa* in the *Mārtāṇḍamāh.*, for *Bum^azu*); i. 267 (*Sēṣanāga* in the *Amareśvaramāh.*, for the older *Suśramanāga*, recte *Suśravonāga*); Note C, i. 124 (*Jyeṣṭheśvara*, the present *Jyēṭhēr*, turned into a site of *Jyeṣṭhā*), etc.

It would be easy to multiply examples showing the strange vicissitudes to which old topographical names are exposed at the hands of the local Purohita. But the explanations already given will suffice to prove that the topographical data found in Māhātmyas can only then be used safely when they are critically sifted and supported by our more reliable sources.

A critical examination of these data is, however, much impeded by the difficulty we experience in fixing the exact age of particular Māhātmyas and their component portions.¹ Even in the case of apparently old texts modern additions and changes may be suspected, while again the most recent concoctions may preserve fragments of genuine tradition.² In view of these considerations I have not thought it safe to crowd my maps with hundreds of names of petty Tīrthas as found in the Māhātmyas, but have marked only those pilgrimage sites the ancient names of which can be established with certainty.

¹ The difficulty here indicated is increased by the fact that no really old manuscripts of Māhātmyas seem to be preserved in Kaśmīr. MSS. written on birch-bark, *i.e.*, earlier than the 17th century, are quite unknown at present. Of the numerous paper MSS. I have examined, none seem to me older than two centuries at the utmost. It is probable that this absence of older copies is due to the rough usage to which Māhātmya MSS. are exposed when carried about on the pilgrimage tours.

² I am glad that chance gave me an opportunity of gaining some personal experience of the manner in which Māhātmyas are occasionally produced. Some ten years ago the Purohitas or Bāchbaṭṭas of the Ganāpatyār quarter in Śrīnagar recovered an ancient Liṅga from a Mosque and began to erect a small shrine for it near the river Ghāṭ of Malāyār. Guided by a local tradition which, as far as I can judge, may be genuine, they believed this to have been the site of the shrine of Śiva Vardhamāneśa mentioned already in the Rājatarāṅgiṇī (see note ii. 123). The Liṅga was re-consecrated accordingly by this name.

In 1891, when examining old sites in this part of the city, I also visited the temple of Vardhamāneśa then under construction. The interest I showed in the old Liṅga and in the tradition regarding it, coupled with an appropriate Dakṣiṇā, soon secured me the confidence of the head-Purohita of the little shrine. 'Paṇḍit' T.R., a man more intelligent than the average of his fraternity, was not slow to confess to me that the Māhātmya of the Tīrtha *in spē* was as yet under preparation. Some weeks later when in camp near Śrīnagar, I received the visit of my Purohita from Vardhamāneśa's shrine. He brought me the draft of the new Māhātmya and asked my assistance in revising it.

I found it to consist chiefly of extracts from the Vitastāmāhātmya. The passages dealing with Vardhamāneśa and the neighbouring Tīrthas within the city had been suitably amplified with laudatory verses in the usual Māhātmya style culled from other texts. The vested interests of other local shrines had received due recognition by being included in the *Yātrā* of Vardhamāneśa. I did what I could to indicate the genuine names of these localities. This quasi-antiquarian co-operation does not seem to have detracted from the popularity of the new Māhātmya among the Bāchbaṭṭas of Ganāpatyār.

32. It is a curious fact that among our authorities for the *Topographia sacra* of Kaśmīr we must allow a conspicuous place to a Muhammadan writer. It is ABŪ-L-FAZL, the minister of Akbar, who in the chapter of his *Āin-i Akbarī* dealing with the 'Sarkār of Kaśmīr' has left us a very accurate account of many of the holy places in the Valley.¹ Abū-l-Fazl's detailed description of Kaśmīr is valuable in many respects to the historical student. But it is particularly in connection with our topographical search that we must feel grateful to the author for having like his great master "caught some of the enthusiasm of the Valley" (Rennell).

Abū-l-Fazl tells us that "the whole country is regarded as holy ground by the Hindu sages." He also refers in general terms to the numerous shrines dedicated to the various deities and to the popular worship of 'snakes,' *i.e.*, the Nāgas, "of whom wonderful stories are told." He then proceeds to describe in detail the most notable sites, giving among these particular prominence to what Dr. Bernier aptly called 'les merveilles' of the country.

This account of Abū-l-Fazl represents for us an authentic survey of all the Kaśmīrian Tīrthas that were well-known and popular at the end of the 16th century. It serves as a most useful link between our older texts dealing with these pilgrimage places and the modern tradition. It helps us to check the data of the Māhātmyas in many particulars of topographical interest. Abū-l-Fazl's notes have enabled me to trace in more than one instance the position of ancient Tīrthas or particular features regarding them which have since his time been wholly forgotten.² It cannot be doubted that Abū-l-Fazl's list of sacred sites to which we have to refer so frequently in our subsequent notes, was supplied by competent Brahman informants just as his abstract of the Sanskrit Chronicles.

¹ Vol. i. pp. 564-570 in Prof. Blochmann's edition of the *Āin-i Akbarī*; vol. ii. pp. 354-366 in the Bibliotheca Indica translation of the work (Col. H. S. Jarrett). Abū-l-Fazl's account of Kaśmīr would well deserve a fuller commentary than the one which the translator, in the absence of special local studies, was able to give. The account of Mīrzā Ḥaidar (in the *Tārīkh-i Rāshidī*) and Bernier's notes could conveniently be discussed on the same occasion.

² Compare my notes on *Bhedāgiri* (i. 35), the *Sūradātīrtha* (i. 37), the *Takṣakanāga* (i. 220); also supplementary note to i. 107.

SECTION VII.—LOCAL TRADITION.

33. It now remains for us only to indicate briefly what help surviving tradition offers for the study of the ancient topography of Kaśmīr. The tradition with which we are here concerned, presents itself in two forms. One is the tradition of the ‘learned,’ regarding the ancient sites of the country in general, kept up more or less in connection with written records. The other is that genuine local tradition which is strictly confined in its limits but is kept up equally among literate and illiterate of particular places.

Local tradition of
the learned.

Among those who represent in Kaśmīr learned tradition of the former type there must again be distinguished the few Paṇḍit families of Śrīnagar in which the serious study of Sanskrit Śāstras has been maintained, and the great host of ‘Bāchbaṭṭas.’ With the latter class we have already become partially acquainted in the course of our examination of the Māhātmyas. We have had occasion to note the conspicuous absence of genuine knowledge as regards the ancient topography of the country in those texts which form the characteristic products of this class’ literary activity.

The Purohitas’ knowledge of Sanskrit is ordinarily of the scantiest kind, and their ‘reading’ confined to Māhātmyas and devotional texts learned by heart without proper comprehension. We can hence scarcely expect them to have preserved genuine traditions regarding those historically interesting localities which are mentioned only in the Chronicles. It is only in the matter of those sacred sites, pilgrimage routes and the like which form as it were, their own particular professional domains, that their testimony can claim special attention. Yet even in this limited field the Purohitas’ traditions are, as we have seen, often of a very modern growth. Their statements, therefore, require under all circumstances to be tested with critical caution.

34. ‘Learned’ tradition as represented by the Śrīnagar Paṇḍits of modern times, is best gauged by an examination of what the late Paṇḍit SĀHIBRĀM († 1872) has specially recorded on the subject of ancient sites.

Sāhibrām’s Tīrtha-
saṅgraha.

P. Sāhibrām who was undoubtedly the foremost among Kaśmīrian Sanskrit scholars of the last few generations, had been commissioned by the late Mahārāja Raṅbir Singh to prepare a descriptive survey of all ancient Tīrthas of Kaśmīr. For this purpose a staff of Paṇḍits was placed at his disposal whose business it was to collect the necessary

materials in the various parts of the country. The large work which was to be prepared on the basis of these materials, was never completed, and of the latter themselves I was able to recover only small portions.¹ But some time before his death Paṇḍit Sāhibrām had drawn up abstracts of the information he had collected under the title of *Kāśmīratīrthasaṃgraha*, and of these I have been also able to obtain copies. The most detailed and apparently latest recension of this Tīrthasaṃgraha is the one contained in No. 61 of Prof. Bühler's collection of MSS. now at Poona.

This little work gives a list of numerous Tīrthas with brief indications of their special features and position, arranged in the topographical order of Pargaṇas. It is useful enough as a comprehensive synopsis of such sacred sites as were known at the time to local worship. The references to many obscure little shrines, Nāgas, etc., show that the enquiries of Paṇḍit Sāhibrām's assistants had been extensive. But the work proves at the same time how little help traditional learning in Kaśmīr could offer in our days for the serious study of the old topography of the Valley.

Paṇḍit Sāhibrām's plan is to indicate each Tīrtha's position by mentioning the territorial division in which it is situated, as well as the nearest village or other well-known locality. It was undoubtedly the learned author's desire to give all local names in their old Sanskrit forms as far as they were known to him. Accordingly we find a number of localities correctly mentioned by their genuine old designations. But unfortunately the number of the latter is truly insignificant when compared with those local names which are plainly recognizable as new fabrications, as worthless as those already mentioned in connections with the topography of the modern Māhātmyas.

In consideration of the fact that P. Sāhibrām deserves to be looked upon as the best representative of modern Kaśmīrian scholarship,² it is only just to illustrate the above remarks by a few examples. I take them only from among those local names the genuine forms of which can be easily ascertained from the Rājatarāṅgiṇī. The lake of the Nāga *Suśravas*,³ the present Suśram Nāg, is named *Suśramanāga* in one

¹ The papers acquired by me refer to some of the north-eastern Pargaṇas and contain descriptions (in Sanskrit) of the various Nāgas, Liṅgas, etc., the miraculous stories relating to them, together with the devotional texts which are supposed to be used at their worship. Quaint illustrations and maps accompany the text. The whole forms a large-sized folio. The critical value of these records is very slight.

² See Prof. BÜHLER's *Report*, pp. 4, 38.

³ See *Rājat.* i. 267 note, and below, § 59.

recension and *Suṣumṇanāga* (!) in the other. The old Parganas of *Holaḍā*, *Laulāha*, *Khūyāśrama* are turned on account of their modern names *Vular*, *Lōlau*, *Khuyāhōm*, into the 'Rāṣṭras' of *Volara*, *Lalava*, *Khoyahāma*. *Bānāhāl*, the old *Bāṇasālā*,¹ figures as *Bhānuśālā*; *Khruv*, the ancient *Khadūvī*,² known correctly even to so late a text as the *Lokaprakāśa*, as *Khrāva*. The well-known *Khonamuṣa* (*Khunāmoh*) appears as *Kṣuṣṇamoṣagrāma* (!) The name of the ancient village *Jayavana*³ which fares badly too, as we have seen, in the *Māhātmyas*, is metamorphosed into *Jivana*; *Raṇyil*, the old *Hiraṇyapura*,⁴ is with a flight of historical fancy turned into a foundation of king *Raṇāditya* (!).

Even the sacred Tīrtha of *Tūlamūlya* (*Tulāmul*) does not escape a renaming as *Sthūlamūla*, though in this case the local *Māhātmya*, with its *Tūlamūla*, keeps close enough to the old name.⁵ After this, village names like *Uṣkara*, *Rāmāśrama*, *Kīcakāśrama*, as designations of the old *Huṣkapura*, *Rāmuṣa*, *Kṛtyāśrama* can scarcely surprise us.⁶ The number of districts, towns, villages, streams, lakes and other topographical features (exclusive of Tīrthas) mentioned by Paṇḍit Sāhibrām amounts to nearly three hundred. But scarcely two dozens of the names given for them are in accord with our old authorities.

Paṇḍit Sāhibrām was one of the few modern Kaśmīrian scholars who have seriously occupied themselves with the *Rājatarāṅgiṇī* and the later *Chronicles*. This is shown by the elaborate abstracts he had prepared of these works.⁷ Hence the indifferent knowledge of ancient topography as displayed in his *Tīrthasaṅgraha*, must appear all the more striking. Yet in reality it is easily enough accounted for.

What knowledge learned tradition in Kaśmīr has retained of ancient sites as distinct from Tīrthas and the like, is confined to a few prominent localities which, for one reason or the other, were of special interest to the Paṇḍits. Thus the capital *Pravarapura-Srīnagara* with several of its quarters, *Vijayeśvara*, *Suyyapura*, *Varāhamūla*, *Padmapura*, and some other places of importance in the Valley have continued to be known by their ancient names. This was probably because these names never ceased to be employed in colophons of Sanskrit manuscripts, in horoscopes, and similar records. In the case of a

¹ See note viii. 1665, and below, § 41.

² See note viii. 733; also § 105 below.

³ Compare note vii. 607, and § 105 below.

⁴ See note i. 287, and § 104 below.

⁵ Compare note iv. 638.

⁶ See notes i. 168; ii. 55; i. 147.

⁷ These abstracts, called *Rājatarāṅgiṇīsaṅgraha*, were acquired by Prof. BÜHLER; see Nos. 176-8 of the Poona collection. It deserves to be noted that in them no attempt whatever is made to explain points of topographical interest.

few other localities again like *Jayapura*, *Dāmodara's Uḍar*, *Cakradhara*, there were well-known popular legends which plainly indicated their identity with sites mentioned in the *Rājatarāṅgiṇī*. But for the great mass of ancient places there were no special reasons of this kind to assure a recollection of their old names. It is hence only natural that all genuine knowledge of their identity and earlier history has gradually disappeared from the Paṇḍits' tradition.

Nothing but systematic enquiry on the lines of modern historical research could help towards a recovery of the knowledge thus lost. But such an enquiry could not be expected either from P. Sāhibrām or any other indigenous scholar uninfluenced by Western critical methods.

35. Popular local tradition has fortunately in Kaśmīr proved far

**Popular local tradi-
tion.**

more tenacious than the tradition of the learned. I have often derived from it valuable aid in my local search for particular sites. My

antiquarian tours have given me ample opportunity to convince myself that when collected with caution and critically sifted, such local traditions can safely be accepted as supplements to the topographical information of our written records. In illustration of this statement I may refer to the evidence gathered from local tradition in reference to the sites of *Lohara*,¹ *Hastivañja*,² *Kramavarta*,³ *Jayapura*,⁴ *Skandabhavana*,⁵ etc.

In more than one instance it can be shown that local legends which Kalhaṇa heard, still cling unchanged to the same sites. As striking examples may be mentioned here the legends concerning *Dāmodara's Uḍar*,⁶ the burned city of King *Nara*,⁷ the temple of *Pravareśa*.⁸

It cannot be doubted that this tenacity of local tradition in Kaśmīr is due largely to the isolation secured for the country by its alpine position. Nothing is more instructive in this respect than a comparison with the territories of ancient Gandhāra and Udyāna, or with the Panjāb plains. These regions so rich in ancient Hindu sites are particularly devoid of local traditions connected with them. This fact is easily understood if we think of the many and great ethnic changes which

¹ See *Rājat.* Note *E* (iv. 177), § 15.

² See *Rājat.* note i. 302, and *J. A. S. B.*, 1895, pp. 379 *sq.*

³ Compare Note *D* (iii. 227); *J. A. S. B.*, 1895, pp. 384 *sq.*; also below, § 43.

⁴ See note iv. 506 *sqq.*, and below, § 122.

⁵ See Note *K* (vi. 137).

⁶ See note i. 156; below, § 119.

⁷ See note i. 202; below, § 108.

⁸ See note iii. 350; below, § 96.

